

VOLUME 14·1990

BYZANTINE AND MODERN GREEK STUDIES



CENTRE FOR BYZANTINE, OTTOMAN AND MODERN GREEK STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies is an annual journal devoted to all aspects of Byzantine and modern Greek scholarship. It welcomes research, criticism, contributions on theory and method in the form of articles, critical studies and short notes.

Editor:

John Haldon (University of Birmingham)

Business Editor:

Anthony Bryer (University of Birmingham)

Founding Editor:

Donald Nicol (King's College, London)

Editorial Board:

Roderick Beaton (King's College, London)

Robin Cormack (Courtauld Institute)

David Holton (Selwyn College, Cambridge)

Peter Mackridge (St. Cross College, Oxford)

Margaret Mullett (Queen's University, Belfast)

For information on the submission of manuscripts, subscription rates and the business address of the journal, see the inside back cover.

Typeset by Cheshire Typesetters/Bemrose Press Ltd., 21 Chaser Court, Greyhound Park, Chester, CH1 4QQ.

Printed and bound by Cheshire Typesetters/Bemrose Press Ltd., 21 Chaser Court, Greyhound Park, Chester, CH1 4QQ.

VOLUME 14·1990

BYZANTINE AND MODERN GREEK STUDIES



CENTRE FOR BYZANTINE, OTTOMAN AND MODERN GREEK STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

Contents

ARTICLES:

- | | |
|---|-----|
| The epigrams of Leo the Philosopher
BARRY BALDWIN | 1 |
| The imperial panels at San Vitale:
a reconsideration
CHARLES BARBER | 19 |
| The Aleppo question: a Byzantine-Fatimid
conflict of interests in northern Syria in the
later 10th century
WESAM FARAG | 44 |
| Sexual morality in Byzantine learned and
vernacular romance
LYNDA GARLAND | 62 |
| The Oxford colloquium on orality in
medieval and modern Greek poetry:
introduction
PETER MACKRIDGE | 123 |
| What is orality — if anything?
RUTH FINNEGAN | 130 |
| Literacy as symbolic strategy in Greece:
methodological considerations of topic and
place
MICHAEL HERZFELD | 151 |

Orality and the reception of late Byzantine
vernacular literature 174
RODERICK BEATON

Orality in Cretan narrative poetry 186
DAVID HOLTON

The metrical structure of the oral
decapentasyllable 200
PETER MACKRIDGE

Text as song: the oral aspirations of
Anghelos Sikelianos 214
SARAH EKDAWI

Musicality in modern Greek poetry 224
CHRISTOPHER ROBINSON

SHORT NOTES:

A manuscript of the monastery of the
Soumela, Trebizond, now at Selly Oak,
Birmingham 241
NEVILLE BIRDSALL

The inauguration anthem of Hagia Sophia
again 247
ANDREW PALMER

Peasant categories in the 10th and 11th
centuries 250
ALAN HARVEY

CRITICAL STUDY:

Dancing with deconstructionists in the
Gardens of the Muses: new literary history vs ? 258
MARGARET MULLETT

List of Abbreviations

AASS	<i>Acta Sanctorum</i>
AB	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>
ABSA	<i>Annual of the British School at Athens</i>
AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
B	<i>Byzantion</i>
BF	<i>Byzantinische Forschungen</i>
BHG	<i>Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca</i>
BMGS	<i>Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies</i>
BNJ	<i>Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher</i>
BS	<i>Byzantinoslavica</i>
BZ	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
CFHB	<i>Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae</i>
CSCO	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</i>
CSHB	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae (Bonn)</i>
DHGE	<i>Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique</i>
DIEE	<i>Δελτίον τῆς ἱστορικῆς καὶ ἐθνολογικῆς ἐταιρείας τῆς Ἑλλάδος</i>
DOP	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
DTC	<i>Dictionnaire de théologie catholique</i>
EEBS	<i>Ἑπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν</i>
EHR	<i>English Historical Review</i>
EO	<i>Échos d'Orient</i>
GRBS	<i>Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies</i>
IRAIK	<i>Izvestija Russkago Arkheologičeskago Instituta v Konstantinopole</i>
JA	<i>Journal Asiatique</i>
JGR	<i>J. & P. Zepos, Jus Graecoromanum</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
JÖB	<i>Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik</i>
JÖBG	<i>Jahrbuch der österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft</i>
MGH	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</i>

<i>MPG</i>	J.P. Migne, <i>Patrologia series Graeco-Latina</i>
<i>MPL</i>	J.P. Migne, <i>Patrologia series Latina</i>
<i>OCP</i>	<i>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</i>
<i>PO</i>	<i>Patrologia Orientalis</i>
<i>RE</i>	<i>Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> (Pauly-Wissowa)
<i>REB</i>	<i>Revue des Études Byzantines</i>
<i>REG</i>	<i>Revue des Études Grecques</i>
<i>ROC</i>	<i>Revue de l'Orient Chrétien</i>
<i>VV</i>	<i>Vizantijskij Vremennik</i>
<i>ZDMG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
<i>ZRVI</i>	<i>Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta</i>

SHORT NOTES

A manuscript of the monastery of the Soumela, Trebizond, now at Selly Oak, Birmingham

J. NEVILLE BIRDSALL

As I reported to the International Colloquium on Greek Palaeography and Codicology, Berlin and Wolfenbüttel, October, 1983, I have for some years been gathering the materials for a catalogue of the Greek manuscripts housed in the Mingana Collection of the Central Library of the Selly Oak Colleges, in the city of Birmingham, England. The intervening years, for personal and administrative reasons, have not seen the appearance of this intended catalogue, but this delay has not been altogether detrimental, for occasionally some additional information has come to light. This short note reports one such piece of information, which I consider should be given to colleagues without further delay.

The manuscript which bears the number Mingana 7 contains a colophon on fol. 136 recto, showing that the scribe is Anastasios Proikonesios. A reference in *Studies in Eastern Chant* 3 (1973)¹ indicates that two other manuscripts written by this scribe are known, namely Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, Supplement Grec no. 1046, and the Gritzanes Collection (Zante) ms. no. 17. A photograph of the Paris manuscript, kindly supplied by the authorities there, has enabled me to verify the authenticity of the colophon of the Selly Oak manuscript. The hand and style are identical. The Selly Oak manuscript's colophon contains no date; since the Paris manuscript is dated 29 May 1795, we may date this other manuscript by the same scribe in the same general period. The manuscript describes itself as an 'anthology of sticheraria containing all the *doxastika* of the year and of the feasts

1. Ed. Milos Velimirović (Oxford 1973) 167f.

of the Lord and of the Mother of God, and of other saints, arranged by the most musically gifted Lampadarios of the great Church of Christ, Petros the Peloponnesios'.

The colophon runs as follows:—

ἀντεγράφη διὰ χειρός ἐμοῦ ἀναστασί(ου)
προικονησί(ου) ἐκ τοῦ ἰδί(ου) ἰδιοχείρου
πέτρου δομestίκου τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας

καλύπτει λίθος τὴν γράσασάν με χεῖρα
ὡς ὀλιγώρος τῆς δ' ἡδυφώνου βίβλου
κύδιστον πέτρον ποιητὴν πολλῶν τ' ἄλλων
ἀλλ' ἐμ' οὐ κρύψει γαίη ἐῆς κόνεσ(σ)ιν
πάντων δ' ἀνθρώπων κείσομ' ἐν τοῖς στόμασι

Because of the brief time allocation at Berlin, these verses were not read out in full, but were alluded to simply as 'A dodecasyllabic form of the theme ἡ μὲν χεῖρ ἡ γράσασα'.

Had the verses been read aloud, a fellow congrésiste might well have been able to make a further identification, since the verse had already been published by Paolo Eleuteri² in an article which continues the collection of colophon verses on this theme begun by Garitte,³ continued by True.⁴ In Eleuteri's list,⁵ *sub numero* 137, a reference is given to such a verse, identified by its initial and final lines, which the compiler has derived from the catalogue of the manuscripts of the monastery of the Soumela at Trebizond, published by A.I. Papadopoulos-Kerameus in *Vizantijskij Vremmenik* 19 (1912) *sub numero* 22.

The description of this Soumela manuscript by the cataloguer as having 138 leaves, measuring 0.0222 cm. in length and 0.0165

2. Paolo Eleuteri, 'Altri manoscritti con i versi 'H μὲν χεῖρ ἡ γράσασα . . Ὡσπερ ξένοι χαίρουσιν e simili', *Codices manuscripti* 6 (1980) Heft 3, 81-87.

3. Gerard Garitte, 'Sur une formule des colophons de manuscrits grecs (ἡ μὲν χεῖρ ἡ γράσασα), in *Collectanea Vaticana in honorem Anselmi M. Card. Albareda e Biblioteca Vaticana edita* (Studi e Testi 219, 220) I (1962) 359-390.

4. Kurt Treu, 'Weitere Handschriften mit der Schreiberformel ἡ μὲν χεῖρ ἡ γράσασα', *Scriptorium* 24 (1970) 56-64. Cf. Stig Y Rudberg, 'Note sur une formule des colophons grecs', *Scriptorium* 20 (1966) 66, 67; Johannes Koder, 'Ein inschriftlicher Beleg für ἡ μὲν χεῖρ ἡ γράσασα', *Scriptorium* 28 (1974) 295.

5. *art. cit.* 82.

cm. in breadth, enabled me to confirm⁶ that this must be the manuscript now to be found in Birmingham, since these dimensions are identical. The colophon is found on leaf 136 (as is the case of the Soumela manuscript, in the catalogue description) and the transcription by Papadopoulos-Kerameus agrees closely with my own transcription. The only differences are two in number, and are evident corrections of the orthography by the earlier cataloguer, namely in writing 'sticherarion' (which he transcribes in Greek) with an *iota* in the first syllable, where the manuscript reads an *eta*, and in the restoration of the epic dative plural form with two sigmas in the penultimate line, without the diacritical indication of correction, which is used in the transcription here above. (I have more recently observed that in an earlier catalogue of the Soumela manuscripts,⁷ Papadopoulos-Kerameus in fact transcribed the word in question with one sigma, as in the manuscript). It would seem to me that the identification leaves no room for doubt. The former ms. 22 of the Soumela has found a home in Birmingham.

The manuscript is bound in leather: on the front cover is a circular cartouche with the figure 4 inscribed. Inside, on the flyleaf is written in pencil the letters 'kapsos', and in the top outer corner, the price £3 30 (thus, without any point between the figures).

Some other manuscripts in the Mingana Collection seem to come from the same lot, to judge from these external later features. Mingana/Greek manuscripts 5, 6 and 8, are all bound in the same fashion, ms. 6 having its leather binding tooled in gold. Ms. 6 has on the inner side of the first flyleaf, the same letters 'kapsos' with the figure 1 beneath, and, at the end of the volume 'kapos' with the figure 1 similarly. In both these places too, it has the same figures for price, written £330 at the beginning of the manuscript, and at the end as £3.3.0. Its page length is 0.158 cm., its breadth 0.112 cm.

6. After my initial confirmation of these data, I made a further visit to the Library on 14 September, 1989, in the company of Professor A.A.M. Bryer and Father Mihail Spatarelu, who each greatly assisted me on a number of points.

7. This was published in 1898 as an appendix to E. Th. Kyriakides, *Ἱστορία τῆς παρὰ τὴν Τραπεζοῦντα ἱερᾶς, βασιλικῆς, πατριαρχικῆς, σταυροπηγιακῆς μονῆς τῆς Ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου Σουμελά* (Athens 1898)

Mingana Greek ms. 5 has a Greek inscription on the inside of the front cover. This describes the book as a Hirmologion belonging to a hieromonk, whose name is unfortunately partially illegible. The flyleaves front and back have been used to practise Arabic or Turkish script or are covered in childish drawings. Its page length is 0.169 and its page breadth 0.113.

Mingana Greek ms. 8 has no such inscriptions on flyleaves or elsewhere. It is to be linked with these formerly mentioned by the common style of binding, and by the palaeographical judgement of Mr. Nigel Wilson (in manuscript at the Selly Oak Colleges Central Library) that mss. 5, 6 and 8 are written in hands of the seventeenth or eighteenth century, a view in which I concur. It has one word on the inside of the front cover, which appears to read as ουμαλων : a sign beside it, suggests that this word is a byform of ὁμαλόν, and that the sign is a practice stroke for correct writing.⁸ The page length of this manuscript is 0.233 cm., its breadth 0.154 cm.

Mingana Greek ms. 5 describes its content as ἀναβασία τῶν δεσποτικῶν καὶ θεομητορικῶν ἑορτῶν. A search of the catalogue of Papadopoulos-Kerameus utilizing all these data yields no identification of this or the manuscripts 6 (a hirmologion) and 8 (an anastasimatarion) as manuscripts formerly in the library of the Soumela. They appear in binding and in the general dating of their scripts to be grouped chronologically with Mingana Greek ms. 7. But their association otherwise would seem to be simply as eventually part of the stock of the same dealer, from which they presumably passed by purchase of Alphonse Mingana⁹ into the hands of Edward Cadbury, and thus into the Mingana Collection.

Another manuscript, Mingana Greek ms. 4, has a link with the region of Trebizond. It is a sticherarion, carrying the date of ζρπς (= A.D. 1678), written by Gabriel Hieromonachos: a later

8. I owe this interpretation to Father Spatarelu. On the signs, see A. Tardo, *L'antica melurgia bizantina* (Grottaferrata 1938) 294-297; Egon Wellesz, *Byzantine Music and Hymnography* (Oxford 1961) 297-299.

9. See D.S. Margoliouth and G. Woledge, 'Alphonse Mingana 1881-1937, in *Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts*, III (Cambridge 1939) v-xii, esp. vii.

hand has added in the colophon above this name, the surname of σκυριανου. This scribe seems otherwise unknown. At the beginning of the text however, a small panel stands at the head of the page, and within the panel is the name σεβαστοῦ τραπεζοντίου τοῦ κυμινήτου. This is the well known Trapezuntine scholar of the seventeenth century,¹⁰ and appears to be his mark of ownership.

This manuscript has on its first flyleaf the word 'kapos', with the numeral 5 written beneath, all in pencil, and the price indication £5 crossed by four diagonal lines. Its page length is 0.21 cm., and its breadth 0.146 cm. These data indicate that it reached Birmingham by the same route as the others. The ownership inscription suggests that it too had links with the region of Trebizond, and we may accordingly suggest that all these five manuscripts came from that same area. One of their number, Mingana Greek ms. 7, is without doubt originally part of the Library of the Soumela as noted by Papadopoulos-Kerameus in 1884, and twice published in 1898 and 1912 (this latter publication being posthumous).

Birmingham/Darlington

10. E.Th. Kyriakides, *Βιογραφίαι τῶν ἐκ Τραπεζοῦντος Λογίων* (Athens 1897) 62, 76.
11. I owe this point to Professor Bryer, who identifies the handwriting.

'Be Amorous, But Be Chaste. . .': Sexual morality in Byzantine learned and vernacular romance

LYNDA GARLAND

Tales of love and romance, although love stories were regarded of less account than other literary themes, had always been a part of the literature of ancient Greece:

'There never was a time in the history of Greek Literature when a good story of personal adventure of any kind, erotic or non-erotic, tragic, comic or scandalous, wonder-seeking or realistic, was not welcome to readers or listeners, so long as it was presented within the context of an approved literary form, or on a suitable oral occasion. The Greeks from the earliest times were familiar with all kinds of stories and enjoyed them.'¹

It was in the ancient novel that the love theme came to be a dominant, independent, literary genre, and it was through this genre, available to certain social classes throughout the Byzantine Empire, that tales of love and adventure reached the Byzantine reading public, and provided for them a 'κτῆμα τερπνὸν πᾶσιν

* George Gordon, Lord Byron, *English Bards and Scottish Reviewers*, 306, 'Be warm, but pure; be amorous, but be chaste. . .'.¹

1. Ben Edwin Perry, *The Ancient Romances; A Literary-historical Account of their Origins* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1967) 83. Love and passion, however, were considered debasing for a hero in ancient Greece; see Sophie Trenkner, *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period* (Cambridge 1958) 55f., 'Aeschylus. . . held love to be a motive unworthy of tragedy. In the famous literary discussion in the *Frogs*, Aristophanes makes him express his proud boast that he had never shown a woman in love (*Ran.* 1043)'. Even the erotic themes of Euripides were generally of perverted, incestuous or unhappy love affairs, though there were tales of romantic, 'eucatastrophic', love current in literary and oral tradition: see *ibid.*, 56ff., esp. 58n. 1; Barry Baldwin, 'Eros in Graeco-Roman Society and Literature', *Mosaic* 1 (1968) 27-42.

ἀνθρώποις'.² As fantasy literature and an 'expression of the ideals of the masses',³ the novel demonstrated, by its widespread popularity and by the conventions of plot, characterisation and treatment, the popular reading matter of the Hellenistic and early Byzantine world, which perhaps was tempted to turn to 'escapist literature' because of its increasing lack of political freedom.⁴ Only rivalled by the exotic and adventurous tales of hagiography as light reading,⁵ the novels, while they ceased to be written by the close of the fourth century,⁶ did not cease to be read, and greatly influenced the Byzantine concept of love and romance, until they were themselves imitated in the twelfth century by the learned romancers Prodhomos, Eugenianos, Manasses, and

2. Longos, proem 3, ed. and trans. Georges Dalmeyda, *Longus Pastorales (Daphnis et Chloé)* (Paris 1934) 2; see Carlos García Gual, 'La roman grec dans la perspective des genres littéraires', *Erotica Antiqua. Acta of the International Conference on the Ancient Novel* (Bangor 1977) 99-105. For the possible audience/readership of the ancient novel, see Donald Norman Levin, 'To Whom Did the Ancient Novelists Address Themselves?', *Rivista di Studi Classici* 25 (1977) 18-29. For the individualistic approaches of the novelists to their love theme and narrative, see Graham Anderson, *Eros Sophistes. Ancient Novelists At Play* (American Philol. Assoc. 9 1982) esp. 87-92.

3. Ben Edwin Perry, 'Chariton and his Romance from a Literary-Historical Point of view', *AJP* 51 (1930) 97.

4. Moses Hadas, *History of Greek Literature* (New York 1950) 292; see also Martin Braun, *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature* (Oxford 1938) 3f. For a discussion of the wider origins of the novel, see Graham Anderson, *Ancient Fiction, The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World* (London/Sydney 1984) 1-19.

5. Hans-Georg Beck, 'Marginalia on the Byzantine Novel', *Erotica Antiqua*, 62. For the similarity of themes and motifs, and the relationship of the saint's life to the novel, see Zoja Pavlovskis, 'The Life of St. Pelagia the Harlot; Hagiographic Adaptation of Pagan Romance', *Classical Folia* 30/2 (1976) 138-49; Tomas Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Oxford 1983) 154-65, and 'The Parthenope Romance Decapitated?', *Symbolae Osloenses* 59 (1984) 61-92; cf. Franca Ela Consolino, 'Modelli di santità femminile nelle più antiche Passioni romane', *Augustinianum* 24 (1984) 83-113; for hagiographic elements in *Digenes Akrites*, see Erich Trapp, 'Hagiographische Elemente im Digenes-Epos', *AB* 94 (1976) 275-87. Saints' lives can be as fictional as romance: for the life of St. Theoktiste of Lesbos (10th century) (*AASS* Nov. IV 224-33; cf. *BHG* 1723-26), a fictional production modelled on the equally unhistorical life of St. Mary of Egypt, and its atmosphere of romance, see Hippolyte Delehaye, *Mélanges d'hagiographie grecque et latine (Subsidia Hagiographica* 42; Brussels 1966) 299-306; L.G. Westerink, *Nicéas Magistros, Lettres d'un exilé (928-946)* (Paris 1973) 27f., 41-6.

6. See Perry, *Ancient Romances*, 343-50; B.P. Reardon, 'The Greek Novel', *Phoenix* 23 (1969) 294.

Makrembolites.⁷ The ancient novel also seems to have had an impact on the treatment of love and romance in Arabic poetry, which was later to influence the development of Greek popular romance in the great 'romance-epic' *Digenes Akrites*,⁸ the themes and concepts of the Greek novel being thus perpetuated in both learned and popular Byzantine literature. But while the Byzantine romances owe much to the ancient works, their treatment of sexual morality and handling of the erotic nature of their subject is markedly different in tone and approach from their models, and the learned romances of the twelfth century display simultaneously a regard for chastity and decorum and an enjoyment of erotic innuendo and description which are typically Byzantine, but which are, however, reflected but little in the Byzantine works preserved in the vernacular, namely *Digenes Akrites* and the fourteenth century popular verse romances.

The ancient romances were widely distributed in Hellenistic times in papyrus form⁹ and may also have been broadcast to the lower, illiterate or impoverished classes by recitation, perhaps by itinerant story-tellers.¹⁰ Knowledge of the Byzantine interest in

7. According to Perry, *Ancient Romances*, 103, 'miserable pedants. . . trying to write romance in what they thought was the ancient manner'; Hägg, *The Novel*, 75, 'From later critics and philologists they have won only utter contempt — no disparaging term has been spared — and have consequently not been subject to very much serious analysis'.

8. Gustave E. von Grunebaum, 'The Arab Contribution to Troubadour Poetry', *Bulletin of the Iranian Institute* 7 (1946) 140, 'hellenistic tradition provided the means, or the patterns, through which the sharpened sensibilities of the Arab-speaking world could express themselves. . . the great gift of Hellenism to Arab poetry (of the 7th Century). . . was that peculiar type of sentimentality which, while traceable to the fifth century B.C., culminated several centuries later in the emotions displayed by the heroes of the Greek novel'; see also Tomas Hägg, 'The Oriental Reception of Greek Novels: a Survey with some Preliminary Consideration', *Symbolae Osloenses* 61 (1986) 99-131; A.F.L. Beeston, T.M. Johnstone, R.B. Serjeant, G.R. Smith, *Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period* (Cambridge 1983) 460-82.

9. Perry, *Chariton*, 95: 'The discovery since 1890 of the papyrus fragments of ten or more new romances, all relatively early, and of three of Chariton alone, shows that this type of literature must have been widely read'.

10. Alexander Scobie, *Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage. Essays on Apuleius, Petronius and the Greek Romances* (Meisenheim am Glan 1969), 19, 'Hence many members of the lower classes probably received what literary entertainment they wanted from itinerant story-tellers who performed at a fraction of the cost of the smallest book.' See also *ibid.*, 20-27; *idem*, 'Storytellers, Storytelling, and the Novel in Graeco-Roman Antiquity', *Rheinisches Museum* 122 (1979) 229-59.

the Greek novel stems entirely from written sources, but it is not impossible that oral entertainment on similar lines continued amongst the lower classes, although hagiography was presumably the light literature of the masses, and interest in the sophisticated novel the characteristic of only a restricted and intellectual élite. Significantly, the Byzantines tended to ignore the innately erotic qualities of the novels; the ecclesiastical historian Socrates is unusual in terming the *Aethiopika* 'πονήματα ἑρωτικά βιβλία',¹¹ and generally the work of Heliodoros in particular was looked upon as a model of conduct, possibly because later generations considered him to have been a bishop.¹² The same claim was also made for Achilles Tatios, and it was this belief that enabled the Byzantines to peruse the romances without shame and consider them allegories of the virtues of the soul and its mystical union with God.¹³ The 'incident' in Achilles Tatios, in which Klitophon succumbs to the importunities of the love-sick Melitte,¹⁴ procured, to a degree, the criticism of later readers,¹⁵ but the general eroticism, prurience and love theme went unchallenged and even inspired whole-hearted approval.¹⁶ Psellos,

11. Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, V, 22 (MPG 67, col. 637), who considers them the work of the author's youth.

12. Socrates, *loc.cit.*, At the end of the oldest MS of the *Aethiopika*, the eleventh-century scribe has written, 'σωφροσύνης θεκατοπίνακα νέοις Θεοδοσίου παῖς φοινῖξ Ἡλιόδωρος, ὡς ἂν ὁρῶντες νέοι σωφροσύνης μεγάλῃον ἀναδῆσονται' (R.M. Rattenbury, 'Chastity and Chastity Ordeals in the Ancient Greek Romances', *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society* 1 [1926] 61).

13. R.M. Rattenbury, 'Heliodorus, Bishop of Tricca', *PLPLS* 1 (1926) 175f.; cf. Photios, *Bibliothèque*, ed. R. Henry, I (Paris 1959) cod. 73; Socrates, *loc.cit.*; for Achilles Tatios, see the Suda s.v. Ἀχιλλεὺς Στάτιος, 'γένονεν ἑσχατον χριστιανὸς καὶ ἐπίσκοπος.' Allegorical interpretations of the novels were proposed by Psellos, Phillipos da Cerami and Joannes Eugenikos; see Beck, *Marginalia*, 59; N.G. Wilson *Scholars of Byzantium* (London 1983) 186, 217. For the Byzantine reception of the ancient romances, see H. Gärtner, 'Charikleia in Byzanz', *Antike und Abendland* 15 (1968) 47-69; Andrew R. Dyck, 'Achilles Tatius' Reception in Byzantium', *Tenth Annual Byzantine Studies Conference, Abstracts* (Cincinnati 1984) 11.

14. *Achilles Tatius, Leucippe and Clitophon*, ed. Ebbe Vilborg (Stockholm 1955) V, 27.

15. Photios, *Bibliothèque*, cod. 87 (Henry II, 11): 'ἀλλὰ τὸ γε λίαν ὑπεραίσχρον καὶ ἀκάθαρτον'.

16. Photios, cod. 73 (Henry I, 147): 'Ἔστι δὲ τὸ σύνταγμα δραματικόν, φράσει δὲ πρεπούση ὑποθέσει κέχρηται· καὶ γὰρ ἀφελεία καὶ γλυκύτητι πλεονάζει. . .

for example, in discussing the relative merits of the two best known novelists, Achilles Tatios and Heliodoros, is uncritical of the novels' content and theme,¹⁷ and the four Byzantine learned romances of the twelfth century, written in imitation of the ancient novel, clearly show that their authors esteemed and were well versed in the novels of antiquity, particularly the works of Achilles Tatios and Heliodoros.¹⁸ In modelling their works in form, content, and style as closely as possible on these two romances, the Byzantine novelists of this period were indeed tacitly stating that this form of fiction still had great appeal for their contemporaries, as the manuscript tradition makes clear.¹⁹ The Byzantines therefore had a great interest in the love story, which considering the restrictions of their daily environment, is perhaps not sur-

"Ἐρωτα μὲν ἀνδρὸς ὕφαινει καὶ γυναικὸς, σωφροσύνης δὲ δείκνυσι πόθον καὶ φυλακὴν ἀκριβή. . .". Cf. *Anthologia Palatina*, IX, 203 (cited by Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, 163).

17. Text in *Heliodori Aethiopica*, ed. A. Colonna (Rome 1938) 363-5; Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, 165-7; trans. by Wilson, *Scholars*, 174-6 (and see also J. F. Boissonade, *Michael Psellus: De operatione daemonum* (Nürnberg 1838) 48-52, trans. by Wilson, *Scholars* 172-4). For a commentary, see Andrew R. Dyck, *Michael Psellus, The Essays on Euripides and George of Pisidia and on Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius* (Vienna 1986) 77-118.

18. Achilles Tatios influenced twelfth century occasional poetry as well as romance, and his novel is specifically mentioned in a poem by 'Manganeios' Prodromos; see Elizabeth M. Jeffreys, 'The Comnenian Background to the "romans d'antiquité"', *B* 50 (1980) 479; Alexander Kazhdan (in association with Simon Franklin), *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Cambridge 1984) 112f. For an analysis of the influence of Achilles Tatios on the work of Manasses, see R. Anastasi, 'Sul romanzo di Constantino Manasse', *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medievale* 11 (1969) 214-36, esp. 216-222; n. 30 below. See also Ole Langwirth Smith, 'Fra "Tyche" til "Eros". Den Hellenistiske Roman i Byzans', *Museum Tusculanum* 40-3 (1980) 541-51. For the development of fictional writing during the eleventh century, see Charlotte Roueché, 'Byzantine Writers and Readers: Storytelling in the Eleventh Century', in *The Greek Novel A.D. 1-1985*, ed. Roderick Beaton (New York 1988) 123-33; *ibid*, 131, 'While. . . there is no evidence in the eleventh century for the composition of pure fiction. . . as well as the use of a new quality of description, we can observe the taste for two new kinds of story-telling: the hero story and the moral fable. Surely these are the essential progenitors of the novel'. Roderick Beaton, 'The Greek Novel in the Middle Ages', *ibid*, 135, sees the romances written between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries in Byzantium as belonging to a continuous, evolving literary tradition.

19. Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, xvff., lxxiiff.; *Heliodore. Les Éthiopiennes*, ed. R.M. Rattenbury, T.W. Lumb, 1 (Paris 1960) xxiv-xlii; Dalmeyda, *Longus*, xiv-xlvi. For the popularity of the Byzantine works see Hägg, *The Novel*, 75.

prising:²⁰ just as erotic entertainment in saints' lives was provided by tales of demons and seductresses, which only increased the popularity of hagiography, so the ancient novel, because of its innate eroticism, romantic escapism and sentimentality, was a source of enjoyment for its public and must have appealed particularly to those middle and upper-class Byzantines, constrained by the strict behavioural and moral conventions of their society, who had access to these works. The romances were a means of escape through literature into a world of fantasy, and their popularity is explained by the need for such an escape, while the very repetitiveness of the novels' themes and motifs show that these were the romantic ideals of the society which created them, as they later became for the twelfth century society that read and perpetuated them.

The demand of the Hellenistic world had been for a combination of love and adventure, and that this was equally to the taste of the Byzantines is shown by the similar themes of hagiography, which differ perhaps only in the lack of sexual attributes given to the saintly heroines.²¹ Moreover, the authors, in writing such novels, were catering to the demands of their public, who were reading the works as much for the love interest as for the veneer of edifying material and stylistic virtuosity, even though, to the modern reader, the works might appear to be boring, indecent or sensationalist,²² and the lovers themselves to be simply a

20. See Beck, *Marginalia*, 61f.; Braun, *History and Romance*, 45f., 'It is a fact which may seem paradoxical, but it has a psychological basis, that anti-erotic polemics usually go hand in hand with a strong and intense interest in erotic incidents and narratives. . . Nothing can illustrate this better than the luxurious growth of a kind of ascetic eroticism in the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, or in the legends of the saints or monks. And so we see. . . a combination of anti-erotic preaching with a lively interest in erotic events'.

21. John Anson, 'The Female Transvestite in Early Monasticism: The Origin and Development of a Motif', *Viator* 5 (1974) 11, 'the lives of the later transvestite virgins move in a world of pure erotic romance'; Alexander Kazhdan, Giles Constable, *People and Power in Byzantium* (Washington 1982) 112f.

22. See, for example, S.L. Wolff, *The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction* (New York 1912) 129f., 'But even had Leucippe entered upon her adventures pure in heart, these are of such a gross and revolting nature, they involve so much physical and moral exposure, that Artemis herself could hardly have come through them untainted. . . Unfortunate as Leucippe is, one can but feel that she is akin to those errant dames who, to their regret, become "the Helen of so many Parises" that their pristine bloom is gone'.

device on which to hang the story and 'mere puppets of circumstance, mechanically endowed with the saccharine virtues of chastity and readiness to die whenever they get into trouble.'²³ In the ancient novel, the characters, with certain exceptions,²⁴ all maintain their chastity, and it is the struggles of the heroes and heroines alike to preserve their innocence and sexual purity in all trials and temptations that motivated the plot and interested the public. Ostensibly the works conform to a 'new middle-class idealism',²⁵ and this insistence on sexual continence and moral respectability was naturally to the taste of their Byzantine readership.²⁶ Indeed, the Byzantine learned romancers in their imitation of such works take this emphasis on chastity and purity for their protagonists to extremes, and thus highlight the expectations of their readership regarding the behavioural conventions of romance protagonists.

These Byzantine works, the *Rhodanthe and Dosikles* of Theodore Prodromos, the *Drosilla and Charikles* of Niketas Eugenianos, the *Hysmine and Hysminias* of Eustathios Makrembolites²⁷ and the fragmentary *Aristander and Kallithea* of Con-

23. Perry, *Chariton*, 115.

24. Klitophon in Achilles Tatios, V, 27 (Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, 110); Daphnis in Longos, III, 17-19 (Dalmeyda, *Longus Pastorales*, 65-7).

25. Perry, *Ancient Romances*, 72. See also Perry, *Chariton*, 134; Carl Werner Müller, 'Chariton von Aphrodisias und die Theorie des Romans in der Antike', *Antike und Abendland* 22 (1976) 118.

26. Typical Byzantine attitudes to sexuality and enjoyment are shown by Kekaumenos, *Strategicon*, ed. B. Wassiliewsky, V. Jernstadt (St. Petersburg 1896; repr. Amsterdam 1965) 42-55; Anna Komnena, *Alexiad* III, 8 (ed. Bernard Leib, *Anne Comnène, Alexiade*, I [Paris 1937] 125f.). For a unique oration in defence of pleasure see Manuel II Palaiologos, *Oratio V* (MPG 156, cols. 464-84). For the Byzantine attitude towards love and sexuality, see especially Hans-Georg Beck, *Byzantinisches Erotikon. Orthodoxie-Literatur-Gesellschaft* (Munich 1984); Kazhdan, Constable, *People and Power*, 62-72.

27. Edited by R. Hercher, *Erotici Scriptores Graeci*, II (Leipzig 1859); the works of Makrembolites and Eugenianos are also edited by R. Hirschig, *Erotici Scriptores Graeci* (Paris 1856), and that of Eugenianos more recently by F. Conca, *Nicetas Eugenianos' "Drosilla and Charicles"* (Amsterdam 1986). These romances are described by E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Leipzig 1914) 554-77; K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur* (Munich 1897) 376-80, 763-6; Herbert Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 2 (Munich 1978) 119-42. For summaries of *Hysmine and Hysminias*, see J.C. Dunlop, *History of Prose Fiction*, (revised by H. Wilson), I (London 1888) 77-82; Hägg, *The Novel*, 73-80.

stantine Manasses,²⁸ which have generally been regarded in modern times with disfavour,²⁹ borrow greatly from ancient romance,³⁰ and are dated usually to the mid twelfth century, the works of Prodhomos, Eugenianos and Manasses being in general assigned to the period 1140-60 and that of Makrembolites to the 1180s, though the order of composition and interrelationship between the four works is a matter of some dispute.³¹ The ap-

28. Edited by Otto Mazal, *Der Roman des Konstantinos Manasses* (Vienna 1967); and E. Tzolakis, *Συμβολή στη μελέτη του ποιητικού έργου του Κωνσταντίνου Μανασσή και κριτική έκδοση του μυθιστορηματός του "τά κατ' Ἀρίστανδρον καὶ Καλλιθέαν"* (Thessaloniki 1967). See O. Lampsides, 'Notes sur quelques manuscrits de la Chronique de Manassès', *Akten des XI. Internationalen Byzantinisten-Kongresses. München 1958* (Munich 1960) 295-301; Rohde, *Der griechische Roman*, 567; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 377.

29. See Rohde, *Der griechische Roman*, 560f.; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 764; K. Svoboda, 'La composition et le style du roman de Nicéas Eugénianos', *Actes du IVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines* 1 (1934) 191; Perry, *Ancient Romances*, 103. For more recent views, see Margaret Alexiou, 'A Critical Reappraisal of Eustathios Makrembolites' Hysmine and Hysminias', *BMGS* 3 (1977) 24, 'the romances. . . reflect a genuine attempt to re-create in a twelfth-century context, insofar as the conventions of learned literature permitted, a genre which had ceased to exist'; Svoboda, *La composition*, 191-201; M. Gigante, 'Il romanzo di Eustathio Makrembolites', *Akten des XI. Internationalen Byzantinisten Kongress*, 168-81; Alexander P. Kazhdan, 'Bemerkungen zu Niketas Eugenianos', *JöBG* 16 (1967) 101-17; Herbert Hunger, 'Die byzantinische Literatur der Komnenenzeit, Versuch einer Neubewertung', *Anzeiger, phil.-hist. Klasse, österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften* 105 (1968) 59-76; Stavros Deligiorgis, 'A Byzantine Romance in International Perspective: The Drosilla and Charikles of Niketas Eugenianos', *Neo-Hellenika* 2 (1975) 21-32; Herbert Hunger, *Antiker und byzantinischer Roman* (Heidelberg 1980); Beaton, *The Greek Novel*, 134-40; Hägg, *The Novel*, 73-80.

30. Dunlop, *History of Prose Fiction*, 77, (of Makrembolites) 'Indeed, in this last and feeble example of Grecian fiction, we seldom meet with an incident of which we have not the prototype in the romances of Heliodorus or Tatios'; see Alexiou, *Critical Reappraisal*, 33-6; Gigante, *Il romanzo*, 170-81; Beaton, *The Greek Novel*, 134-40; Anastasi, *Sul romanzo*, 214-36. For Eugenianos' borrowing from the Greek anthology, see Herbert Hunger, 'On the Imitation (MIMESIS) of Antiquity', *DOP* 23-4 (1969-70) 37f.

31. The dating of Makrembolites' romance is particularly in dispute. A.P. Kazhdan, Ann Wharton Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Berkeley/L.A. 1985) 202, believe it to have been the earliest of the works; see S.V. Poljakova, 'O chronologičeskoj posledovatel' nosti romanov Evmatija Makremvolita i Feodora Prodhoma', *VV* 32 (1971) 104-8, and 'K voprosu o vizantino-francuzskich literaturnych svjzjach (Povest' ob "Ismine i Isminij" Evmatija Makremvolita i "Roman o roze" Gijoma de Lorris)', *VV* 37 (1976) 114-22; but Beaton, *The Greek Novel*, 136, believes that *Rhodanthe and Dosikles* predates by at least a decade the *romans d'antiquité* and is practically the first attempt at a sustained work of secular

pearance of four such similar works, whatever their parodic or other underlying intentions, is symptomatic of a general interest in romance and romantic expression which becomes apparent in twelfth century literature,³² but, despite large-scale dependence on the ancient novels, and the ostensible theme of passionate all-powerful love,³³ the Byzantine romances display an attitude towards sexual morality which is noticeably that of their own time and society.

In the Byzantine learned romances, marriage is the goal for which all characters aim and, though there are a number of attempts made upon their chastity, twelfth century romance keeps its heroes and heroines strictly virginal until the actual wedding ceremony which closes each work. Although the heroines occasionally behave without modesty or conventional decency — Hysmine is a case in point³⁴ — their morality impels them not to sacrifice their virginity before marriage, even to their lovers,

fiction in medieval Europe; Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur*, 137-42; E.M. Jeffreys, *Comnenian Background*, 476-83; Kazhdan, Franklin, *Studies*, 87-114. For the possibility of the influence of the thirteenth century *Roman de la Rose* on Makrembolites' romance, see Carolina Cupane, 'Il motivo del castello nella narrativa tardo-bizantina. Evoluzione di un' allegoria', *JöBG* 27 (1978) 250-61 and 'Ἐρως βασιλεὺς: La figura di Eros nel romanzo bizantino d'amore', *Atti Accademia di Scienze, Lettere e Arti di Palermo*, ser. IV 33/2 (1973-4) 274-81.

32. For the introduction of individual emotions into works of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as seen in Prodnomos' poems, see Kazhdan, Franklin, *Studies*, 112f.; E.M. Jeffreys, *Comnenian Background*, 479; Beck, *Marginalia*, 59f.; Hägg, *The Novel*, 75, 'The Byzantine novels seem to have been much read, in spite of the fact that the learned language in which they were written must have made them inaccessible to a general audience'; for the manuscript tradition of the romance of Makrembolites, see A. Cataldi Palau, 'La tradition manuscrite d'Eustathe Makrembolites', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 10 (1980) 75-113.

33. Beaton, *The Greek Novel*, 138, stresses Prodnomos' commitment to rhetoric as a way of livelihood and interest in chance and human powerlessness: 'Prodnomos was a highly intellectual writer with little interest in his ostensible subject-matter; the emotions of his hero and heroine are treated in a perfunctory way. Not so the things that *happen* to them. . . ' but cf. Kazhdan, Franklin, *Studies*, 113, 'The twelfth century saw the appearance of the Byzantine romance, which attempted, albeit clumsily, to revive the poetry of love; and Prodnomos was among its earliest practitioners'.

34. Dunlop, *History of Prose Fiction*, 77, 'Eustathius is the first who has introduced his heroine avowing love without modesty and without delicacy.' Compare the behaviour of Leukippe, Achilles Tatios, II, 19; IV, 1 (Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, 35f., 70f.).

however importunate.³⁵ All the girls, as the romances open, are young and pure in heart, with no experience at all of sexual relationships or of contact with men, very much in the manner of the ancient novel, but being even more secluded in their upbringing. Rhodanthe, Prodromos' heroine, for example, is uncertain how to behave in mixed company and feels her position keenly, for she has been brought up in strict seclusion, her only outings of any sort being to the public bath,³⁶ while Kalligone, Leander's love in *Drosilla and Charikles*, has also been raised within a similarly sheltered background and restricted environment, isolated from all contact with men. Her inexperience and embarrassment when Kleander calls some words of love to her are such that she giggles and slaps the faces of her maid-servants,³⁷ though the heroine of this romance, Drosilla, is first seen by Charikles at a festival, at which a number of young girls are present, who are teased by the onlookers for their modesty; the details of Drosilla's background and upbringing, restricted or otherwise, are not revealed.³⁸ Chrysochroe, the beloved of the hero's friend, Kratander, in the romance of Prodromos, is certainly secluded to a degree, but can receive a message from her suitor proposing marriage. He steals into her room at night to effect an elopement, but the plan is foiled by the watchfulness

35. Prodomos (hereafter *Prod.*) III, 271-93; Eugenianos (hereafter *Eug.*) VIII, 139-62; Makrembolites (hereafter *Makr.*) V, 17.

36. *Prod.* II, 58-75, 175-80; II, 302-9, Dosikles fears the effect her seclusion might have on his suit; cf. *ibid.* I, 118-21. Compare the secluded upbringing of Kallirhoe in the ancient novel (Chariton, I, i, 5; I, i, 8; I, i, 14, ed. Warren E. Blake, *Charitonis Aphrodisiensis De Chaerea et Callirhoe Amatoriarum Narrationum Libri Octo* (Oxford 1938) 1-3). For the ancient motif of a secluded girl being escorted to the public baths, which had in fact fallen into disuse long before the twelfth century, see *Vie de Ste. Mélanie*, 2, ed. D. Gorce (Paris 1962) 132; Cyril Mango, 'Daily Life in Byzantium', *JÖB* 31/3 (1981) 337-53.

37. *Eug.* II, 60-2, 109-13; he flatters her with a conventional compliment calculated to bring a blush to the cheeks of the young person, 'ἔργου πάρεργον μεῖζον, ὦ κόρη, βλέπω/ χεῖλη φιλεῖν σου μεῖζον ἢ λείχειν μέλι' (*ibid.*, II, 105f.).

38. *Eug.* III, 162-72, 336-8. A festival was one of the few opportunities for secluded girls to meet lovers in the ancient novel; see Chariton I, i, 5 (Blake, *Charitonis*, 1f.) Xenophon of Ephesos, *Les Éphésiaques, ou le roman d'Habrocomès et d'Anthia*, I, ii, 2-9, ed. and trans. Georges Dalmeyda (Paris 1926; repr. 1962) 4-6; Heliodoros III, 3-4 (Rattenbury, Lumb, *Les Éthiopiennes*, I, 100-5). For the motif in Middle and New Comedy (for a respectable Athenian woman, as opposed to a hetaira, who can be seen in the street), see Trenkner, *The Greek Novella*, 110.

of the guard Brya and the girl is accidentally killed.³⁹ Hysmine too is a product of the same background, despite her forward behaviour at the beginning of Makrembolites' romance. Her whispers to Hysminias, her deliberate exposure of her arms to the elbow, and her secret and suggestive touching of the hero's hands are all designed to attract his attention and interest, but they are far from proper behaviour.⁴⁰ When the startled Hysminias inadvertently alerts her parents of what is happening, Hysmine's mother Pantheia is excessively angry and furious beyond all reason. Hysmine, when her advances are discovered, blushes and keeps her eyes downcast in the manner prescribed for a girl of her age and position, betraying her shame and embarrassment.⁴¹

All the heroines revert to this proper maidenly behaviour, despite the excitement, experiences and adventures which intervene, when reunited with their parents at the close of the work and before their marriage, and it is especially noticeable in Hysmine, who, in the presence of her parents, is silent and weeps,

39. *Prod.* I, 162-89; cf. Achilles Tatios, II, 19-24, 25-31 (Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, 35-43), for the attempted assignation and elopement of Leukippe and Klitophon. For the frequency of elopements in 12th. century romance, despite the topos of seclusion for the girl, see *Prod.* II, 436-41; *Eug.* III, 366f.; III, 14-25; VII, 57-73; *Makr.* VI, 9. Note her father's insistence on Chrysochroe's virginity in his laments on her accidental death, *Prod.* I, 212-9, 337-40.

40. *Makr.* I, 8-10; see also II, 14. Cf. *Prod.* VIII, 301f., and for the Empress Irene Doukaina's dislike of showing her elbow publicly (not to mention her eyes and voice), see *Alexiad.* XII, 3, 3 (Leib, I, 60). Like Semiramis and Ninos (Ninos fr. A.5, B.1, ed. Bruno Lavagnini, *Eroticorum Graecorum Fragmenta Papyracea* [Leipzig 1922]), Leukippe and Klitophon (Achilles Tatios, I, 4f.; Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, 5-7) and Daphnis and Chloe (Longos, I, 6f.; Dalmeyda, *Longus Pastorales*, 5f.) Hysmine and Hysminias meet in a domestic setting. The truly secluded maiden, (e.g., *Prod.* II, 171-90, *Eug.* II, 57-117; cf. *Prod.* I, 162-77), has more in common with the heroines of the *Digenes Akrites* epic-romance, [*AND* 77-97 (Irene); *GRO* IV, 480-505 (Eudokia)] than with the heroines of the ancient novel; see below ns. 79, 90.

41. *Makr.* I,9; I,10. Cf. *ibid.*, VI,1; X,16; II,4 for the description of the figure of Σωφροσύνη on the frieze in Hysmine's garden (together with Φρόνησις, Ἴσχυς and Θέμις), of which the central scene features Eros in full panoply. For Pantheia's demonic frenzy, when in Hysminias' dream she discovers him seducing her daughter and titles the thunderstruck lover a shameless adulterer, thief, despoiler, hypocrite, rapist and a second Paris, who has stolen her 'maiden treasure', which all mothers zealously guard in their daughters, and incites an army of women to tear him to pieces, see *ibid.*, V, 3.

finds it difficult to speak, and keeps her eyes on the ground.⁴² During their adventures, whatever the temptation or the threat, the girls maintain their superlatively high standard of moral behaviour and continually shun any sexual advances, whether by enemies or even by their lovers,⁴³ while the heroes also are pestered by propositions but never consider acceding to them. Indeed, their sexual inexperience is not only emphasized but proclaimed as a virtue, with Hysminias' behaviour marking him out as totally virginal and, like the girls, knowing nothing whatsoever of love, while Charikles, too, had never loved before.⁴⁴ Yet, despite the complications of the plot, the chastity of heroines or heroes is never seriously threatened except by the importunities of their own lovers. Many would-be suitors only indulge in lengthy and rhetorical speeches or serenade the heroine with elaborate and erudite songs, like Kleinias and Kallidemos, planned abductions never take place, and even Gobryas' attempt at raping Rhodanthe is only half-hearted; she manages to escape without too much difficulty, leaving part of her clothing behind her. Whatever the circumstances, however, the girls are determined not to endanger their virtue and take even the most feeble of threats to their chastity with the utmost seriousness and determination. For Hysmine, in particular, the preservation of her virginity is a necessity of the plot as she is made to take a chastity test, reminiscent of the ancient novel, which she passes to the relief of everybody, all but the reader finding the couple's protestations

42. *Prod.* IX, 276; *Eug.* IX, 257f.; *Makr.* XI, 11, 'σιγὴ γὰρ παρθένοις κόσμος καὶ γλώττης φοιδῶ', (as Hysmine herself says); XI, 12f. For similar behaviour see *ibid.*, V, 12.

43. Rhodanthe shows no interest in Dryas (*Prod.* II, 141-9), and runs from Gobryas (*ibid.*, III, 265-93), while Dosikles dislikes both the idea of marrying Mistylos' daughter Kalippe (*ibid.*, III, 405-525) and the advances of Myrilla, Kratander's sister (*ibid.*, VIII, 242-59, 361-6, 416-27). Drosilla has to shun Kleinias, son of the Parthian chief Κρατυλος (*Eug.* IV, 105-329), and Kallidemos (*ibid.*, VI, 258-666; cf. VII, 13-73), while she has to dissuade Charikles from anticipating their marriage (*ibid.*, VIII, 81-162). Charikles is loved by Chrysilla, wife of Kratylos (*ibid.*, IV, 76-85; V, 61-106). Hysmine only has to fight off the approaches of Hysminias (*Makr.* V, 16-17) and Hysminias those of his mistress (*ibid.*, VIII, 17; X, 6) and Rhodope, daughter of Sostrates (*ibid.*, IX, 15; X, 1f.).

44. *Makr.* I, 14; *Eug.* III, 105f.; cf. Theagenes in Heliodoros, III, 17 (Rattenbury, Lumb, *Les Éthiopiques*, I, 120f.).

of her innocence under the circumstances extremely difficult to credit.⁴⁵ The heroes are also tested by temptation, but, despite the manoeuvres of highly sexed oriental queens, impassioned seductresses, and the most unexceptionable offers of marriage, make a virtue of maintaining absolute chastity until their marriage: indeed, even their attempts on their beloved's virtue tend to be little more than half-hearted. Hysminias in fact goes so far as to feel that his own chastity and qualifications for heraldship have been stained merely by his falling in love — after his dream of Eros, he wakes up in love with Hysmine, rousing his comrade Kratisthenes to tell him that he can no longer continue to be a herald and that he is in fact no longer a virgin,⁴⁶ and all the participants of Makrembolites' romance continually remind the reader, and each other, of the protagonists' state of virginity, perhaps because to a detached onlooker it seems so unlikely. Hysmine behaves as a virgin should do, with tears and the pretence of a headache, when informed of her impending arranged marriage, and these tears are attributed to her innate, and proper, modesty. Her virginity is a reason used by Kratisthenes in pleading for her to escape the fate of sacrificial victim on the storm-tossed ship, and one of which Hysminias makes full use in his rhetorical lament for her, just as he had previously harped on the same fact in lamenting the storm which had blown up, and even more than the other heroes he is very much aware of his own chastity also.⁴⁷ In her letter to Hysminias, when at a banquet with the master to whom he was sold by pirates as a slave, he recognises her as one of the servants, Hysmine is very careful to state clearly that she is still a virgin despite all her sufferings, and it is ob-

45. *Makr.* XI, 17. For chastity tests in the ancient novel see Rattenbury, *Chastity*, 59-71; Achilles Tatios, VIII, 12-4 (Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, 155-7); Heliodoros, X, 7-9 (Rattenbury, Lumb, *Les Éthiopiennes*, III, 82-7).

46. *Makr.* III, 2, 'οὐκέτι Διασίων κήρυξ ἐγώ, οὐκέτι θεράπων Διός, οὐκέτι παρθένος.' See also *ibid.*, IV, 23 where Hysmine has lost her status as virgin because she is in love; VIII, 10, 13; XI, 5. For Hysminias' attempt on her chastity, see V, 17. For falling in love while asleep, see *Eug.* III, 1-12; *Digenes Akrites*, AND 198-254 (for which see below n. 87).

47. *Makr.* VI, 3; VII, 13; VII, 17. Cf. Hysmine's ship-board lament (*ibid.*, VII, 9), 'Ἄλλ', ὦ μήτερ, νῦν προσφορώτατόν σοι τὸ δάκρυον παρθένος τῶν σῶν ἀπεσυλήθην χειρῶν, καὶ παρθένος ἐς Ἄδου μετακοιμίζομαι.'

viously a critical point and one which Hysminias learns ecstatically, being stressed by them both later at their assignation. In this romance, even the villainesses preserve their chastity, like the 'seductress' Rhodôpe who emphasizes her virginity in her propositioning letter to Hysminias.⁴⁸ Pantheia's lament at the altar of Apollo makes the natural assumption that Hysminias has instigated a relationship with her daughter, which shocks her almost more than the actual loss of Hysmine,⁴⁹ while Hysminias emphasizes their virginity in his recapitulation of their adventures, and the work ends in praise of chastity.⁵⁰

The other romances, too, emphasize that the protagonists remain chaste throughout. Dosikles weeps on hearing that Rhodanthe's virginity might be violated by their captors, and when an attempt is made on her virginity by the satrap Gobryas, Rhodanthe runs to Dosikles and begs him to save her for she is still a maiden. He, when they are captured and to be separated, bewails their fate, addressing her with the title of virgin and lamenting their marriage hopes, while Rhodanthe, invoking him in a long lament, answers that he need have no fear for her virginity, for she will remain faithful to their relationship, which has just stopped short of marriage.⁵¹ On an occasion where at a festival many young girls all fall in love with Dosikles, he can only think of Rhodanthe, and when they finally are reunited Rhodanthe protests that she will die rather than marry another.⁵² In Eugenianos, too, when Drosilla is separated from Charikles she apostrophizes him as:

48. *Makr.* IX,8; IX,15; IX,18; X,1. Cf. the role of Lykainion, as an experienced and 'divinely sanctioned educator', in *Daphnis and Chloe*; Donald Norman Levin, 'The Pivotal Rôle of Lycaenion in Longus' Pastorals', *Erotica Antiqua*, 130, 'Daphnis reacts favourably to all that Lycaenion proposes precisely because her approach is not that of the sultry temptress, but rather that of the would-be tutor concerned for the welfare of Daphnis and Chloe both'. His response is markedly different to that of Hysminias on being propositioned.

49. *Makr.* X, 11, 'Ἄλλ' ὁ τύραννος ἐκεῖνος, ἀλλ' ὁ θρασύς, ἀλλ' ὁ τὸ κηρύκιον καταπαίζων, καὶ ὅλον κατεψευσμένος αὐτὸ τὴν σὴν παρθενίαν σεσύληκεν.' See also *ibid.*, X, 12.

50. *Makr.* XI,4f.; XI,23.

51. *Prod.* I,102-5; III,290-3; VI,321; VI,362-413; VII,109-60 (*ibid.*, VII, 115f., 'οὐκ ἀισχνῶ τὸν ἄχρι τοῦ χεῖλους γάμον/ ἢ γοῦν τὸ μέχρι τῆς περιπλοκῆς λέχος').

52. *Prod.* VIII,195-215; IX,36-43; see *ibid.*, III,521f.

‘ “ψυχὴ φίλη” λέγουσα “Χαρίκλεις ἄνερ,/ ἄνερ Χαρίκλεις μέχρι γοῦν φωνῆς μόνης” ’,⁵³ and when they are first presented to the reader their status is made quite clear. Charikles has immediate fears for an attack on Drosilla’s chastity and deliberately emphasizes her purity to Kleinias, the son of Kratylos, who is wooing her. At their reunion, Drosilla at once addresses him as her only husband and swears that she has remained a virgin, and when Charikles tries to entice her into consummating the union she replies that, though she loves him, it would not be right. Drosilla can thus bewail Kalligone, Kleander’s love, who so unfortunately dies, as ‘συμπαρθένε’ and be married as a virgin.⁵⁴ Not only do all the protagonists of Byzantine learned romance insist on remaining chaste until the end of the work, all sexual relationships in fact are viewed as ending in, or preferably beginning with marriage, and matrimony is the goal for which all aim, even secondary characters and potential abductors or rapists. In these works, such relationships can only be envisaged as being permanent and sanctioned by marriage,⁵⁵ while the attitude of the lovers’ parents naturally upholds these moral standards, insisting upon matrimony with a suitably chosen and respectable partner for their children.⁵⁶ Eros in these works is no instigator of unlawful or extra-marital love: in effect, once in love, the protagonists believe themselves to be actually married, in word if not in deed, and all the romancers and their characters assume

53. *Eug.* I,289-90; cf. I,221; III,3-6; V,239; *Prod.* II,61; VII,18; *Makr.* VI,8; Achilles Tatios, VI,11,16 (Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, 95f., 99f.).

54. *Eug.* I,219-22; I,237,243-4; IV,223; VIII,25; VIII,139-46; IX,245. Like Leukippe (Achilles Tatios, IV,1; Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, 70f.) Drosilla has a dream. Compare Hysmine’s reaction under similar circumstances, *Makr.* V,17.

55. *Prod.* II,369-72 (Dosikles and Rhodanthe); cf. VII,57; *ibid.*, I, 168f. (Kratander and Chrysochroe); *ibid.*, III,159-79, 273f. (the satrap — and attempted rapist — Gobryas and Rhodanthe); *Eug.* I, 247-50,290; III,387-93, 398-400 (Charikles and Drosilla); *ibid.* III,3-6 (Kleander and Kalligone); *ibid.* IV,113f.,325f.; V,160f. (Kleinias and Drosilla); *ibid.*, V,87,94,63f.,283f. (Chrysilla and Charikles); *ibid.*, VI,374-7; cf. VI,550-2 (Kallidemos and Drosilla); *Makr.* III,1; V,2; VI,8,18; XI,6 (Hysminias and Hysmine); cf. *ibid.*, VII,7,9 (where the ship on which they elope is called their ‘marriage-chamber’); *ibid.*, X,2 (Hysminias and Rhodope); *ibid.* X,8 (Hysminias and his mistress).

56. *Eug.* VIII,139-62; IX,286-300; *Prod.* IX,310,441-60; *Makr.* VI,2,10; XI,23; cf. *Prod.* I,337-40; II,381-91.

that marriage is the only desirable or possible outcome of the lovers' adventures.

Nevertheless, while the actual sexual morality and propriety upheld in Byzantine romance is far stricter than that presented in the ancient novel, these works are not without their own erotic interest, and in the struggles of the protagonists to protect their virtue and in particular to overcome their own desires to anticipate matrimony, these romances are in many respects more sexually explicit than are their models. Though erotic interest in these romances is limited to demonstrative behaviour between the lovers themselves, and the conventions of sexual morality are observed in that this behaviour never goes too far, still such descriptions enhance the works' appeal. The lovers, when in public, are shown to demonstrate their love in various ways hallowed by traditional literary usage: Dosikles drinks from the cup Rhodanthe has used⁵⁷ and the bashful Hysminias is persecuted by Hysmine, who, on two occasions when trying to attract his attention, indulges in devices such as pressing her foot against his under the table, touching his hand in passing him the wine and tickling and kissing his feet while washing them after the meal, as well as whispering to him and sighing during the meal, and acting coquettishly whenever possible.⁵⁸ On less public occasions, more overt behaviour is permissible. The couples kiss and embrace on every possible occasion in a suitable garden, described in suitably erotic undertones or with suggestively sexual imagery,⁵⁹ at their reunion either under the parental aegis, or under the helpful eye of Maryllis, the old widow who cared for Drosilla, and even, in

57. *Prod.* II,120-8; cf. Dryas' attempt to do the same *ibid.*, II,145-49. For this see *Eug.* IX,207-11; *Makr.* V,12. *Ibid.*, V, 13 Hysminias kisses his mother because she has just kissed Hysmine to 'steal' her kiss. See Dunlop, *History of Prose Fiction*, 80f.; Achilles Tatios, II,4,7,9 (Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, 24-8).

58. *Makr.* I,8-12; II,12-4; cf. *ibid.*, IV, 1. Compare the similarly provocative behaviour of Hysminias' mistress, *ibid.*, X,8. Dunlop, *loc.cit.*, 'Ismene is first enamoured, she first confesses and offers love without modesty, without shame, and without art'.

59. *Prod.* III,62-5; *Eug.* V,32-46; VIII,81-3,132-8; *Makr.* IV,3,21-3; IX,14,15-8,20; cf. Manasses, fr. 113,113a (Mazal, *Der Roman*, 193). See A.R. Littlewood, 'Romanic Paradises: the Role of the Garden in the Byzantine Romance', *BMGs* 5 (1979) 102-5,112f.

Makrembolites, in the girl's room, as well as on the ship on which they are eloping.⁶⁰ In Makrembolites there are other erotic encounters in Hysminias' dreams. After his initial dream of Eros, in which the god is angry with him for not responding to Hysmine's advances, he dreams of indulging in the most explicit love-play with her, and then of trying to overpower her resistance, being discovered in the act by Hysmine's mother Pantheia who marshals against him an army of raging women, and it is as a result of this dream that he begins to fall in love with the girl.⁶¹ Much of the serious love-play in this work indeed occurs in Hysminias' dreams, which allows Makrembolites to unite the essential maintenance of chastity and propriety with the opportunity for describing in detail suggestive and explicit erotic interludes,⁶² and to Hysminias his highly detailed dreams are as real as his actual adventures, although erotic episodes are also experienced at first hand by the protagonists, who hug, kiss and embrace whenever convenient.⁶³ In the other romances, love is communicated by songs⁶⁴ and by letters⁶⁵ and is displayed in the amount of physical, if restrained, contact between the protagonists:⁶⁶ indeed the baring of Rhodanthe's wrists is enough to enable Dosikles to recognise her.⁶⁷ The passion of other

60. *Prod.* IX,343-8; cf. *Eug.* IX,207-11; *Eug.* VII,74-8,219-21,230-5; *Makr.* V,16; VI,5-8; VII,1-5,7.

61. *Makr.* III, 1-3,5-7; V,1-3. Cf. Achilles Tatios, II,23f. (Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, 38-40), where the mother is also named Pantheia.

62. Alexiou, *Critical Reappraisal*, 42, 'If the dreams in this romance are primarily erotic, it is conversely true that the eroticism is mainly confined to the dreams'. See *Makr.* III,1,4,7; V,2-5; VI,18; VII,18; cf. Achilles Tatios, I,6 (Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, 7f.). Dunlop, *History of Prose Fiction*, 80, 'As the work advances these dreams become quite ridiculous, from their accurate minuteness and the long reasonings carried on in them by persons whose stock of logic, even when awake, does not appear to have been very extensive'.

63. *Makr.* IV,1,21-3; V,15-8; VI,5-9; VII,1-5,7; IX,14-22; X,1-4,6-8. For the realistic nature of Hysminias' dreams, see *ibid.*, VII,17.

64. *Eug.* II,326-86; IV,110-50,156-219. See also, for the songs at the festival of Dionysos where the lovers meet, *ibid.*, III,135-96,206-54,263-88,297-321.

65. *Eug.* II,169-85,202-23,240-77,284-314; V,197-239; *Prod.* I,167 (by message); *Makr.* IX,8; X,2.

66. *Prod.* III,58-78, 526-30; at their reunion with their parents they have to kiss in secret (*ibid.*, IX,343-8); *Eug.* I,324-9; V,1-27; VII,74-82,230-5; VIII,84-130.

67. *Prod.* VIII,301f.; cf. *Makr.* I,8; n. 40 above.

suitors, however fervent, is confined merely to words,⁶⁸ and erotic joys are clearly postponed until the correct time and occasion,⁶⁹ while Makrembolites' romance in its use of erotic dreams and its blend of dream and reality, describes detailed love-play without the author defying contemporary conventions of sexual morality.⁷⁰ Chastity, in these romances, must be maintained by all protagonists, male and female, and parental consent for an alliance between two young people is *de rigueur*, but their behaviour and wishes are described in language and expressions which are often extremely explicit and unambiguous, not only in the wish-fulfilment incidents in Hysminias' dreams, but in normal contact between the lovers, as can be seen in the episode when Charikles in Maryllis' garden rather whimsically attempts to persuade Drosilla to consummate their love by taking example from the birds in the trees:

‘ “ὄρᾳς” λέγων “τὰ δένδρα” (δείξας δακτύλῳ)/ “ὅσας νεοττῶν καλιὰς ὑπερφέρει/ ἔκει τελεῖται στρουθίων πάντως γάμος/ παστὰς τὸ δένδρον ἐστὶ, νυμφῶν ὁ κλάδος,/ κλίνην ἔχει δὲ τὰς ἑαυτοῦ φυλλάδας’ . . ./ Δός μοι, Δρόσιλλα, καὶ σὺ τὸν σαυτῆς γάμον. . ./ Ὁ

68. *Eug.* II,275-7; IV,105-219; VI,331-556; V,241; VI,638f.; VII,63-73; *Makr.* IX,15-8; for Gobryas' ineffectual attempt at raping Rhodanthe, even here stressing his marital intentions and calling her his wife, see *Prod.* III,265-93.

69. *Eug.* IX, 295-300, ‘Τί γοῦν τὸ λοιπόν; συζυγεῖσα πρὸς γάμον/ νύμφη Δρόσιλλα τῷ Χαρικλεῖ νυμφίῳ/ καὶ πρὸς δόμους ἄχθεῖσα τῶν γεννητόρων/ μετὰ στεφάνων καὶ κρότων καὶ κυμβάλων,/ ἐν ἑσπέρᾳ μένουσα παρθένος κόρη/ γυνὴ πρὸς ὄρθρον ἐξανέστη τῆς κλίνης.’ Cf. Longos, IV, 40 (Dalmeyda, *Longus Pastorales*, 106); *Eug.* VI,439-50, where Kallidemos uses Daphnis and Chloe and their innocence as an exemplum amid other mythological and literary references in trying to tempt Drosilla to succumb to her charms.

70. Hägg, *The Novel*, 76f., ‘The subsequent development of the love-affair is likewise narrated in alternation between day and night scenes, between reality and dream’. For the explicitness of the dream narrations, as in two of the scenes from his first dream sequence, see *Makr.* V,1-3, ‘Ὁ μὲν μοι τὴν Ὑσμίνην ὑπεζωγράφει ξυμπαιζοῦσαν, φιλουμένην, φιλοῦσαν, δακνομένην ἐρωτικῶς, ἀντιδάκνουσαν, ὅλην ξυμπλεκομένην μοι καὶ καταπλεκομένην ἐξ ἐρωτος· ὁ δὲ μοι καὶ ξυνανέκλινε ταύτην καὶ στρωμνὴν ἐρωτικῶν χαρίτων ὑπέστρωσε, φιλημάτων, γαργαλισμάτων, θλίψεων σαρκῶν, ξυμπλοκῶν χειλέων, περιπλοκῶν χειρῶν, ποδῶν ἐμπλοκῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μελῶν’. . . Κάγῳ τὴν παρθένον ἐφέλκομαι τὰ πρῶτα μὴ θέλουσαν, ξυνέχω, θλίβω, δάκνω, φιλῶ, περιπλέκομαι, καὶ τι δρᾶν ἐθέλων ἐρωτικώτερον οὐ ξυνεχωρούμην τῇ κόρῃ καὶ πρὸς ἔριν μετάγω τὸν ἔρωτα. Κὰν μέσοις τούτοις ἢ τῆς κόρης μήτηρ ἐφίσταται. . .’. For Pantheia's reaction see above n. 41.

στρουθὸς οἶδε μῖζιν εἶναι τὸν γάμον· ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ ποθοῦντες οὐ
μυγνύμεθα;''⁷¹

Despite certain anachronistic contemporary details,⁷² the Byzantine learned romances deliberately present a pagan ancient world in which their characters undergo their trials and tribulations. But in the treatment of love and romance, the twelfth century romancers follow the conventions of the social and moral standards of their time, while at the same time imitating the treatment of sexual relationships of the ancient novelists. 'Love' is a very simple concept of instantaneous and mutual attraction, originating solely in physical appearance, and depicted by the irrational force of Eros. Unlike the ancient novel, chastity is maintained by all protagonists, and the sexual morality within all the romances is ostentatiously strict. The heroines of twelfth century romance, and even the secondary characters such as Kalligone and Chrysochroe, are products of secluded backgrounds and conventions of behaviour far more restricted than those depicted in the ancient novel, where heroines, though chaste and modest, have more freedom of interaction with men, while the Byzantine romance heroines are young, timid and modest, unlike the strong-minded Leukippe and Charikleia, though they still display a little more character and decision than the heroes. Even Hysmine, having once interested Hysminias by her behaviour, becomes bashful and demure, and this modesty seems to a great degree to be part of the heroine's charm, for both lovers and villains seem impelled to greater passion by such timidity of demeanour. This treatment of love and romance reflects contemporary con-

71. *Eug.* VIII,84-8,91,129f.; nevertheless, middle-class morality is always *seen* in these romances to be triumphant.

72. *Ibid.*, 74f.; Beaton, *The Greek Novel*, 137, 'The element of nostalgia for the past glories of classical Greece. . . is vastly developed and extended by Pródromos by the simple expedient of doing, almost a thousand years later, *exactly the same* as his predecessors had done. *Rodánthi and Dosiklis* makes no mention of the Christian Byzantine empire under which it was written, or explicitly of any historical events or circumstances which could be dated specifically to the Christian era'. But see Kazhdan, Franklin, *Studies*, 111f., for Pródromos' use of 'outwardly conventional forms to express specific, contemporary opinions — not only in his 'historical' poems, but also in his ultra-conventional genre-pieces, such as *Rodanthe and Dosicles* and the *Catomyomachia*.'

cepts of love and sexual relationships and these romances, remarkable for the similarity of their concepts, themes and moral standards, must have appealed both to the literary taste and social morality of their readership, as well as to the few erudite scholars who composed them.

Significantly different are the romances preserved in the vernacular, all of which reflect more realistic attitudes to relationships, both in the bicultural border culture⁷³ mirrored in the *Digenes Akrites* epic-romance,⁷⁴ which was probably redacted at the approximate time of the composition of the learned works,⁷⁵ and in the Frankish influenced world of the fourteenth century

73. For a discussion of the work's historical and geographical setting, interaction between Byzantines and Arabs, and a full bibliography, see Catia Galatariotou, 'Structural Oppositions in the Grottaferrata *Digenes Akrites*', *BMGS* 11 (1987) 29-34; Stylianos Alexiou, *Βασίλειος Διγενής 'Ακρίτης* (κατὰ τὸ χειρόγραφο τοῦ Ἑσφοριᾶ) καὶ τὸ ἄσμα τοῦ Ἀρμούρη (Athens 1985) 54-68.

74. For the influence of Eastern and Islamic works on Byzantine popular literature, see especially Alexiou, *Βασίλειος*, 102-34; V. Pecoraro, 'La nascita del romanzo moderno nell' Europa del XIIo secolo. Le sue origini orientali e la mediazione di Bisanzio all' Occidente', *JōB* 32/3 (1982) 307-18; Vassilios Christides, 'Arabic Influence on the Acritic Cycle' *B* 49 (1979) 94-109; George Kehayogiou, 'Translations of Eastern "Novels" and their Influence on Late Byzantine and Modern Greek Fiction (11th-18th Centuries)', in *The Greek Novel*, ed. Beaton, 156-61; Hans-Georg Beck, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur* (Munich 1971) 63-97. According to Vassilios Christides, 'An Arabo-Byzantine Novel 'Umar b.al-Nu^cmān Compared with Digenis Akritas', *B* 32 (1962) 561, 'there occurred a general mutual exchange between Arabic folkloristic materials of the seventh and eight centuries and Greek materials of the eighth century'. Gustave E. von Grunebaum, 'Parallelism, Convergence and Influence in the Relations in Arabian and Byzantine Philosophy, Literature and Piety', *DOP* 18 (1964) 91f., speaks of the 'sharing of folk tale themes and the similarity of the atmosphere which had become condensed in the Digenes epic, on the one hand, and in narratives such as 'Umar b.an.Nu^cmān in the Arabian Nights corpus or the Sayyid Battāl, on the other', while Michael J. Jeffreys, 'Digenes Akritas and Kommagene', *Svenska Forskningsinstitutet i Istanbul Meddelanden* 3 (1978) 17, believes that the Lay of the Emir is a story of Arab origin altered for Christian use.

75. For the dating and interrelationship of the versions of *Digenes Akrites*, its origins and transmission, and its dependence on literary and oral tradition, see especially Michael J. Jeffreys, 'Digenis Akritas Manuscript Z', *Dodone* 4 (1975) 163-201 and 'The Astrological Prologue of Digenis Akritas', *B* 46 (1976) 375-97; Roderick Beaton, 'Was Digenes Akrites an Oral Poem?', *BMGS* 7 (1981) 7-27; Suzanne MacAlister, 'Digenis Akritas: The First Scene with the Apelatai', *B* 54 (1984) 551-74; Erich Trapp, *Digenis Akrites, Synoptische Ausgabe der ältesten Versionen* (Vienna 1971) 13-48; Alexiou, *Βασίλειος Διγενής 'Ακρίτης*, 91-134 (reviewed by Roderick Beaton, *JHS* 106 (1986) 271-3), and 'Ακριτικά, Τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς ἐγκυρότητας τοῦ κειμένου *E*

popular verse romances. The life and career of Digenes Akrites,⁷⁶ the epitome of aristocratic aspirations and ideals,⁷⁷ is permeated with incidents involving romantic interludes and adventures, and is not simply confined to a chain of episodic adventures involving the meeting, separation, and reunion of a pair of lovers before marriage, for, as well as carrying off a wife against well-nigh invincible odds, he is also portrayed in the extant versions of the romance as participating in two extra-marital affairs, which, however ephemeral, are a distinct contrast to the behavioural standards and sexual mores presented in the learned romances. In this romance, regarding which discussion will concentrate on the version of the Grottaferrata manuscript, the version which as well as being preserved in the oldest manuscript has also the most coherent structure and literary affiliations,⁷⁸

— Χρονολόγηση — 'Αποκατάσταση χωρίων — 'Ερμηνευτικά (Herakleion, 1979). For the MSS tradition see also L. Politis, 'L'épopée byzantine de Digénis Akritas. Problèmes de la tradition du texte et des rapports avec les chansons akritiques', *Atti del Convegno Internazionale sul tema: La poesia epica e la sua formazione* (Rome 1970) 551-6. Of the two major versions, the oldest MS, that of *GRO*, is dated to the late 13th. or early 14th. century, that of *ESC* to the late 15th., the underlying version of which may be the oldest of those extant. The confusions of *ESC* are ascribed not to oral tradition but to scribal error. The early or mid-twelfth century, the time of the production of the learned romances and of contact with Crusaders and Westerners as a whole, now seems to be the most likely date of the redaction of *GRO* at least; M.J. Jeffreys, *Digenis Akritas and Commagene*, 28; Michael Angold, *The Byzantine Empire 1025-1204* (London/New York 1984) 218-20.

76. References are to the following editions: *GRO*, J. Mavrogordato, *Digenes Akrites edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford 1956); *ESC*, Alexiou, *Βασίλειος Διγενῆς Ἀκρίτης*; *AND*, Petros Kalonaros, *Βασίλειος Διγενῆς Ἀκρίτας*, 1 (Athens, 1970); *TRE*, Savvas Ioannidis, *Ἐπος μεσαιωνικὸν ἐκ τοῦ χειρογράφου Τραπεζοῦντος, ὁ Βασίλειος Διγενῆς Ἀκρίτας ὁ Καππαδόκης* (Constantinople 1887); *Z*, Trapp, *Digenes Akrites*, based primarily on a compilation of *TRE* and *AND*.

77. Kazhdan, Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture*, 117-9; for the Komnenian 'aristocratic ethos of noble blood, noble violence, and noble luxury', see Paul Magdalino, 'Byzantine Snobbery', in *The Byzantine Aristocracy IX to XIII Centuries*, ed. Michael Angold (Oxford 1984) 68f., 'There were of course highly cultured Komneni with literary pretensions. . . but the majority, including perhaps the emperors themselves, probably felt more at home in the philistine fantasy world of *Digenes Akrites*, a man's man who lived in the country, never met an intellectual, and devoted himself to sex and violence'.

78. See Galatariotou, *Structural Oppositions*, 30, for her reasons for concentrating a discussion of the text on a single version, namely *GRO*. Allusion will also be made to the Escorial version, and the prologue of *AND*, inasmuch as they are agreed to

there is in general an extremely high regard for chastity, particularly in the womenfolk, all of whom are supposed to be chaste before marriage, and faithful to their husbands afterwards, and both Digenes' mother, Irene, and his wife, Eudokia or 'the Girl',⁷⁹ have extremely restricted upbringings, being secluded in exotic dwellings to secure them from the sight of men, Irene from the age of seven years, while, though many princes and kinsmen desired to see Eudokia, her father would allow none even to hear her footstep or voice or catch a glimpse of her shadow.⁸⁰ Even after her marriage, Eudokia lives in near-seclusion, both in the wild and in their palace on the Euphrates,⁸¹ a circumstance that

belong to the older traditions of the work, and pre-date the late fifteenth century. In the Escorial version, despite its more accurate historicity, the language is incoherent, it is metrically suspect and linguistically heterogenous (Beaton, *loc. cit.*). For the romantic prologue to the Andros version, inspired probably by the description of Eudokia and her setting, its composition by the compiler of Z, and its probable dating to the late 15th. century, see M.J. Jeffreys, *Astrological Prologue*, 375-97.

79. While the two heroines are frequently unnamed and given no specific family background, both Irene and Eudokia are said to belong to the Doukas Family, *GRO* IV,43,325; VI,414; *TRE* V,1101-5 (Mavrogordato, *Digenes Akrites*, 68,88). The emphasis on aristocratic birth throughout the work is presumably influenced at least in part by twelfth century attitudes towards nobility: see Kazhdan, Franklin, *Studies*, 105-111; Magdalino, *Byzantine Snobbery*, 63-9. For increased concern with lineage and genealogy, see Kazhdan, Epstein, *Culture and Change*, 102-10; *ibid.*, 117, 'the romance (*Digenes Akrites*) provides a special insight into the mentality of the Byzantine military aristocracy.'

80. *GRO* IV,267-71,486-99; *AND* 77-123. *GRO* IV,291-9,326-30, many noble Romans, with designs of carrying off Eudokia, have been caught and beheaded or blinded by her father. For the Arabic attitudes towards chastity, see *The Ring of the Dove by Ibn Hazm (994-1064): A Treatise on the Art and Practice of Arab Love*, trans. A.J. Arberry (London 1953) 230-84; *ibid.*, 257, 'Adultery violates the sanctity of the harem, confuses the lawful offspring of wedlock, and separates husband and wife; which last God has declared to be a most grievous offence, and is not lightly regarded by any man of intelligence or with the least sense of morality'; *ibid.*, 262, 'The finest quality that a man can display in Love is continence: to abstain from sin and all indecency.'

81. *GRO* IV,960-4; VII,157-73 (cf. *AND* 2314-23,4277-84). She is discomposed by the arrival of some apellates, and runs, veiled, into the tent *GRO* VI,137f. (cf. *AND* 2987f.). For the theme of the girl hidden in a fabulous setting, see Roderick Beaton, 'Digenes Akrites and Modern Greek Folk Song', *B* 15 (1981) 32-4: 'An only daughter is shut away in a beautiful palace and garden to protect her from the dangers of love. The fabulous beauty of both girl and setting is detailed at some length' (*ibid.*, 33). For the motif of the castle in Byzantine romance as a setting for the girl and as the domain of the god Eros, see Cupane, *Il motivo del castello*, 229-67, esp. 234-6.

may well mirror social conditions and expectations on both sides of the frontier,⁸² and perhaps this environment is not unconnected with the literary motif of falling in love by report, or sight unseen, as it is implied Digenes himself did with Eudokia.⁸³ Standards of conduct in the romance are strict: the young twelve year old virgin Irene is eulogised by her brothers, who however expected no less of her, for preferring death to dishonour when abducted by the Moslem Emir⁸⁴ and to save her honour her five brothers are quite willing to be slain, at the exhortation of their mother.⁸⁵ After her abduction Irene does nothing but cry, and she certainly neither kisses the Emir nor even speaks to him.⁸⁶ When, however, overcome by her charms, he proposes marriage, it must be assumed either that her attitude undergoes a complete reversal, or that modesty had compelled her to hide her true emotions, inspired in her by the dream of Eros, even before her feel-

82. Love at first sight is a common feature of Arabian romance: see Gustave E. von Grunebaum, 'Greek Form Elements in the Arabian Nights', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 62 (1942) 283. Concerning the desert romances, see Arberry, *Ring of the Dove*, 12, 'Islam made it increasingly difficult for the situation to develop in which boy meets girl. Love became a complicated and dangerous exploit, though marriage was of course never difficult; the romantic drama acquired its stock characters and conventional scenes'. For a survey of Arabic love poetry see Beeston, Johnstone et al., *Arabic Literature*, 393-432.

83. *TRE* V, 1100-8 (Mavrogordato, *Digenes Akrites*, 88), and *GRO* IV, 286-307 imply that Digenes is in love with the girl and suggests their marriage to his father before he has actually seen her. For the topos of falling in love by report, cf. Chariton IV, i, 8-12 (Blake, *Charitonis*, 56); Achilles Tatios, II, 13 (Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, 30f.); *Prod.* VII, 166-91; for Arabic romance, Arberry, *The Ring of the Dove*, 48-51, 'On Falling in Love through a Description'; Gregoras, *Byzantina Historia*, VIII,3, ed. L. Schopen, E. Bekker (*CSHB* 1829) I,293f., for Eudokia Palaiologina, wife of Constantine Palaiologos in Thessalonika, whose beauty, wit and charm were such that many fell in love with her on hearing her described.

84. *GRO* I,243-4; *ESC* 119-22 (cf. *AND* 462-3,470-2).

85. *GRO* I,75-6,85 (cf. *AND* 325). For a woman's honour in Arabia, see Beeston, Johnston et al., *Arabic Literature*, 397; Galatariotou, *Structural Oppositions*, 44f., 51f., 'The attitude to women in *Digenes* is very like the one generally prevailing in Byzantium; except that it appears to have shifted a step further in the frontier areas, with a much more polarised conception of gender roles and gender relations than appear in the rest of Byzantium'. Female honour in the work depends primarily on the wealth and nobility of the girl's family and her personal, i.e. sexual, honour. For Eudokia, see below n. 111.

86. *GRO* I,308; *ESC* 166 (cf. *AND* 535-7).

ings had any specific object:⁸⁷ the chaste heroine presumably does not bestow her love until she knows that the end of it is honourable, and her prudence keeps it strictly under control. Similarly, Eudokia makes much of her shamelessness when she elopes with Digenes,⁸⁸ but first ensures before she jumps from the window that she has his solemn oath that she will be his lawful wife.⁸⁹ Eudokia, like her mother-in-law Irene before her, has had a very proper and secluded upbringing,⁹⁰ and it is with difficulty that Digenes can even persuade her to lean out of the window so he can see her, before he proposes marriage.⁹¹ This highlights the extreme constraints of behaviour which the romance presumes for young girls.⁹² In contrast to the prudence of Eudokia, the daughter of the Emir Haplorrabdes, who for three years has loved a captive of her father, elopes with him in boy's dress, with the approval of her mother, believing implicitly in the promise of marriage he has given her. Unhappily she is less fortunate than Eudokia for he has deceived her and abandons her to be found later by Digenes, and she is much concerned with the shamelessness of her behaviour.⁹³ Seeing her love for her

87. *AND* 276-7. For the prophecy that Irene must be secluded in a splendid palace and not be allowed to fall in love at the age of twelve because she will be carried off by an Emir, her sight of a picture of Eros which makes her susceptible to Love's power, and her enslavement to Eros in a dream, see M.J. Jeffreys, *Astrological Prologue*, 376-8.

88. *GRO* IV,501-22 (cf. *AND* 1934-7).

89. *GRO* IV,573-83; *ESC* 902-11 (cf. *AND* 1976-86). For this feature of the oath in twelfth century romance also, see *Eug.* III,398-400; *Makr.* XI,6; cf. Xenophon of Ephesos, I,xi,4f. (Dalmeida, *Les Ephésiaques*, 15). Digenes' father, the Emir, had indeed already proposed the marriage, and presumably therefore approved of the elopement and the alliance (*GRO* IV,301-9).

90. *AND* 77-123 (Irene); *GRO* IV,492-500 (Eudokia), 'οὐ τὴν σκιάν δὲ τὴν ἐμὴν τις ἰδεῖν ἠξιώθη,/ φωνῆς οὐδεὶς μου ἤκουσεν ἢ συντυχίας ὁλως,/ οὐ γέλωτος μειδίασμα, οὐ βαδίσματος ψόφον,/ τῆς θυρίδος οὐδέποτε τὴν κεφαλὴν μου ἤγον, ἀλλοτρίοις ἀθέατον ἐμαντὴν διετήρουν,/ ἐκτός γάρ μου τῶν συγγενῶν καὶ τῶν γνωστῶν ἰδίων,/ οὐδεὶς μου εἶδε πῶποτε προσώπου χαρακτῆρα,/ τάξιν τηροῦσα ἀκριβῆ τὴν πρέπουσαν παρθένους.'

91. *GRO* IV,331-48 (cf. *AND* 1746-57). For the comparable modesty and seclusion of twelfth century romance heroines, see above n. 40.

92. So concerned is the girl that all be respectable that she is deeply ashamed that Digenes has not let any great retinue of hers accompany them to his father's house; *GRO* IV,808-15 (cf. *AND* 2206-18); for her massive dowry, and its importance, see *GRO* IV,704-27.

93. *GRO* V,66-149 (cf. *AND* 2551-670).

deserter, Digenes comments conventionally, 'καὶ τότε πρῶτον ἔπαθον ἀγάπην γυναικείαν/ θερμότεραν κατὰ πολὺ ὑπάρχειν τῶν ἀρρένων/ φθείρει δὲ μᾶλλον ἄθεσμος καὶ παράνομος μῆξις',⁹⁴ and, after raping her, an action which perhaps implies that her own conduct has put her beyond the pale of feminine decency, Digenes' solution is for the couple to be married at once, thus preserving the girl's reputation and status, and ignoring his own conduct. Maximo, who as an Amazon is independent of any male protection, is the second female whom Digenes meets who is not restricted by the social conventions whose preservation is so incumbent upon Irene and Eudokia. She is not, however, promiscuous, stating that she has saved her virginity for her conqueror,⁹⁵ and as she wishes to make their relationship permanent,⁹⁶ Digenes has to explain that this is impossible in view of his existing wife: 'νόμιμον ἔχω γαμετὴν εὐγενῇ καὶ ὡραίαν,/ ἥς ἀγάπην οὐδέποτε τολμήσω ἀθετῆσαι'.⁹⁷ He still however takes advantage of the seduction which she initiates, and the redactor of the Grottaferrata manuscript was so shocked by this that he made Digenes return and kill her, more from anger for the Girl's sake than any other — an unnecessary brutality, but one inserted as a sop to conventional morality.⁹⁸

94. *GRO* V,210-2.

95. *GRO* VI,766-70; *ESC* 1563-6 (cf. *AND* 3780-5). For the Maximo episode see Trapp, *Digenes Akrites*, 65f.

96. *GRO* VI,769f., 'σὺ μόνος με ἐνίκησας, σὺ με ἀποκερδίσεις/ ἔξεις δέ με καὶ συνεργὸν εἰς τοὺς ὑπεναντίους'; cf. *TRE* 2654 (Mavrogordato, *Digenes Akrites*, 212; *AND* 3824).

97. *GRO* VI, 773f.; *ESC* 1568-74 cited below in n. 111 stresses not his love but the girl's family wealth and status; cf. *AND* 3788f.

98. *GRO* VI,834-8; VIII,118-200. On Maximo see H. Grégoire, 'L'Amazone Maximo', *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 4 (1936) 723-30. The Greek versions of the romance do not state whether Maximo loses her strength together with her virginity. See Grégoire, *ibid.*, 725, and 'Le Digénis russe', in *Russian Epic Studies*, ed. Roman Jakobsen and Ernest J. Simmons (Philadelphia 1949) 152f., 'Maximo vaincue, désarmée, déshonorée par Digénis, perd sa force avec sa pudeur, et est chassée honteusement par les siens.' On barbarian women in the ancient novel, see Alexander Scobie, *More Essays on the Ancient Romance and its Heritage* (Meisenheim am Glan 1973) 19-34. For the Amazon-like heroines featured in the Arabic romances *Dat-el-Hemma* and *'Umar b.Nu'mān*, both of which are probably based on material from the seventh and eighth centuries, see M. Canard, 'Un personnage de roman arabo-byzantin', *Revue Africaine* (1932) 1-14, 'Delhemma,

The same preoccupation with chastity is not expected of the heroes. The Emir obviously has no idea of marriage in mind when he initially abducts Irene, and it is only when he is inflamed by her tears and sighs, and reassured of her noble birth by her brothers, that he contemplates matrimony. His father, too, apparently occupied himself with abducting young Christian women.⁹⁹ Moreover the Emir has a harem of beauties back in Syria for whose love for others he still feels jealousy even after his marriage to Eudokia.¹⁰⁰ No more is heard of his past wives and children but presumably they return *en masse* with his mother and the rest of the family to 'Romania', and from henceforth the Emir lives quietly with his single wife.¹⁰¹ Digenes, when he begins to woo Eudokia, is entirely inexperienced in love, to such an extent that he tells her that she must show herself to him to teach him what love is,¹⁰² and his intentions towards her are always strictly honourable. He asks his father first to arrange a marriage, and on hearing that this has been tried and is out of the question, makes a proposal of marriage to the girl herself, which he repeats the next day, swearing frightful oaths that he will be true to her.¹⁰³ Just as Eudokia's first thought, as she tells

épopée arabe des guerres arabo-byzantines', *B* 10 (1935) 283-300, 'Delhemma, Sayyid Baṭṭal et 'Omar an-No'mān', *B* 12 (1937) 183-8 and 'Les principaux personnages du roman de chevalerie arabe Dhat al-Himma wa-l-Battal', *Arabica* 8 (1961) 158-73; Christides, *An Arabo-Byzantine Novel*, 558-65.

99. *GRO* II, 64. Abduction is a common feature of this romance; *GRO* IV, 294f., 965f.; VI, 115-58; *ESC* 665-8, 1151-6 (cf. *AND* 1619, 1707f.), as of Arab works; see for example, Canard, *Les principaux personnages*, 161. In *GRO* there are four successful and six attempted bride thefts: see Andrew R. Dyck, 'On Digenis Akritas Grottaferata Version Book 5', *GRBS* 24 (1983) 186; Beaton, *Digenes Akrites*, 30-2.

100. *GRO* II, 87-8, 107-11; III, 127-9, 'καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ κοράσια ἀληθῶς μετὰ τέκνων/ περιεπλέκοντο αὐτόν, ἀπλήστως κατεφίλουν,/ καὶ χωρισθῆναι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἤθελον οὐδ' ὀλως'; cf. *AND* 669.

101. *GRO* III, 236-40 (cf. *AND* 1175-8).

102. *GRO* IV, 332-5, 'Παράκουσον, ὁμάτια μου, ἄς ἴδω σου τὸ κάλλος,/ ἄς ἐμῇ εἰς τὴν καρδίτзан μου ἡ ἀπειρός σου ἀγάπη/ εἰμι γὰρ νέος, ὡς ὄρᾳς· οὐκ οἶδα τί ἐνὶ ὁ πόθος', and see *GRO* IV, 545-6 (cf. *AND* 1747-9, 1966-74). Compare *Eug.* III, 105-6 (Charikles); *Makr.* I, 14 (Hysminias); for the ancient novel, Heliodoros, III, 17 (Rattenbury, Lumb, *Les Éthiopiennes*, I, 120f.).

103. *GRO* IV, 316-8, 'Γνώρισόν μοι, κοράσιον, ἔχεις με εἰς νοῦν σου,/ καὶ εἰ ποθεῖς κατὰ πολὺ τοῦ λαβεῖν σε γυναῖκα/ εἰ δ' ἀλλαχοῦ τὸν νοῦν ἔχεις, πολλὰ οὐ παρακαλῶ σε'; cf. *AND* 1730-3. For the lack of such courtesy in the Russian ver-

her nurse, is that Digenes would make a good son-in-law,¹⁰⁴ so he too makes the position completely clear at the earliest possible opportunity, shouting it out to the world that he is eloping with the girl to marry her, and commenting that his value as a son-in-law outweighs the indiscretion involved and will entirely absolve Eudokia from any blame in consenting to the elopement.¹⁰⁵

Digenes' position with regard to his two extra-marital affairs is ambivalent. He definitely contravenes the strict rule of monogamy in the romance for which certain versions of the work condemn him and he condemns himself;¹⁰⁶ on the other hand both are single occasions on which he falls by reason of temptation, at first with an unwilling partner, the daughter of Haplorrabdes, and the second with the Amazon Maximo who initiates the seduction. For the first sin, that of rape, he does penance by repeating the tale to others,¹⁰⁷ and feels great shame on returning to his girl, and feels he has wronged her also.¹⁰⁸ On the second occasion Maximo shares the moral responsibility and only in the Grottaferrata version does Digenes feel more than slight remorse for this episode whereupon his feelings of guilt impel

sion see Grégoire, *Le Digenis russe*, 159, 'Digénis, assez brutalement, la menace de mort, et lui donne le choix entre le sort d'une épouse volontaire et celui d'une esclave.' For his oaths see *GRO* IV,577-83: ESC 902-11; n.89 above.

104. *GRO* IV,284-5; cf. *AND* 1698f., where it is the comment of Eudokia's nurse.
105. *GRO* IV,550-3, 'καὶ συμβιώσομεν Θεοῦ νεύσει χαίροντες ἄμφω/ ἐπὶ τοῦτο γεννήτορες καὶ οἱ σοὶ εὐφρανθῶσιν,/ γαμβροῦ οἴου τετύχηκαν ἐν γνώσει γεγονότες/ καὶ οὐδεὶς ὀνειδίσαι σε, μᾶλλον δὲ μακαρίσει.' See *GRO* IV,594-5; ESC 902-18, where marriage is not mentioned so explicitly (cf. *AND* 2090-8). Compare the emphasis on the matrimonial aims of the protagonists in the twelfth century romances above.

106. *GRO* V,1-17,231-56; VI,605f. (cf. *AND* 2450-6, 2750-73, 3806-12). This self-condemnation is mostly absent in the account of ESC 1561-78, nor does this version mention the episode of the daughter of Haplorrabdes.

107. *GRO* V,15-7. In this version he is only fifteen years old, presumably to help excuse his conduct (*GRO* V,24). Dyck, *On Digenis Akritas*, 187, suggests that the daughter of Haplorrabdes was in fact the bride of Digenes in an alternative version, which was 'one of several competing versions of Digenes' winning of his wife'. Its incorporation into a version in which Digenes is already married would thus necessitate this episode being altered into one of his extra-marital affairs.

108. *GRO* V,281-9 (cf. *AND* 2797-803).

him to return and murder her.¹⁰⁹ In general Digenes and Eudokia choose to live together in isolation, and their life both in the wild with four servants only, and later in their magnificent palace on the Euphrates, offers little opportunity for other relationships or contacts. The work clearly expresses the significance of the marriage tie and of emotional fidelity: a couple should be inseparable and live together, satisfied with each other's companionship till death. Digenes states this quite clearly when their relationship is threatened from outside, counselling Eudokia not to fear the apelates as no man has the power to part them,¹¹⁰ and without hesitation telling Maximo that he can not possibly leave his own wife for her, as she would have him do, since Eudokia is suited to him on grounds even apart from their love.¹¹¹

In *Digenes Akrites* therefore chastity is regarded as an essential prerequisite for any heroine, and for heroes too, where possible, who should be faithful to their wives, though temporary affairs are permissible and not unexpected. The natural end of any

109. *GRO* VI,827-38; *ESC* 1561-78; cf. *AND* 3825-52; Galatariotou, *Structural Oppositions*, 59-62. See *AND* 3821 for his farewell to Maximo, 'Υπαγε, κόρη μου, καλῶς, μὴ μου ἀλησιμονήσης'. These extra-marital affairs, while recalling those of Klitophon (Achilles Tatios, V,27; Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius*, 110) and Daphnis (Longos, III, 18-19; Dalmeyda, *Longus Pastorales*, 66f.), are alien to the morality of Byzantine romance, where the most shocking incidents are tentative pre-marital attempts on their fiancée's virtue by Charikles and Hysminias (*Eug.* VIII,86-94; *Makr.* V,17).
110. *GRO* VI,142-3. See *ESC* 1304-7 where this is his reply to Philopappos; cf. *AND* 2994f.

111. *GRO* VI,771-4 (cf. *AND* 3786-9). The grounds given in *ESC* 1568-73 are based, significantly, on social conventions rather than sexual morality, and take into account the girl's wealth and family background and thus her suitability as a wife, 'Μὰ τὸν Θεόν, ἡ Μαξιμου, οὐκ ἔν' τὸ ἐνθύμημά σου/ τὴν κόρην τὴν ἐγὼ φιλῶ, τῶν εὐγενῶν ὑπάρχει,/ ἔχει γὰρ πλοῦτος ἄπειρον καὶ συγγενοὺς ἐνδόξους,/ καὶ ἀδελφία πολυορεκτικά καὶ ἀδελφοὺς πλουσίους,/ καὶ πάντας ἐξηρνήσατο καὶ μετὰ μέναν ἦλθεν,/ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πάντων δυνατὸς αὐτὸς νὰ μᾶς χωρίση.' See George Huxley, 'Antecedents and Context of Digenes Akrites, *GRBS* 15 (1974) 336, 'The poet understands the significance of dowries in strengthening the ties between powerful families, though the hero claims that he desires Eudokia only for her beauty (G1695); the bonds are made tighter still when the contract for the dowry was completed with the emir (G1844) and the general and his family presented other magnificent gifts (G1845-82).' Cf. Galatariotou, *Structural Oppositions*, 44, '... the Girl decides to elope with her suitor only after she realises that he is τῶν εὐγενῶν καὶ τῶν πλουσιωτάτων (*GRO* IV,323-5).

love affair is marriage, indeed the redactor of the Grottaferrata manuscript is so concerned with chastity that he inadvertently marries the Emir and Irene twice, the second time on the Emir's return, and only an Amazon can avoid these moral standards because as a barbarian or 'exotic' personage she is not within the scope of the poem's moral and sexual conventions, although the liberated behaviour of Maximo was obviously not to the taste of some of the audience. This emphasis on chastity and fidelity does not of course preclude a strong element of eroticism inherent in the poem.¹¹² All the protagonists are especially marked out and made for love by their outstanding beauty, and it is understood that they are to enjoy the pleasures love can give.¹¹³ The aim of the work is to unite the two couples, the Emir and Irene and Digenes and Eudokia, and love is the primary rationale of their existence; the heroic borderer, Digenes, prefers dalliance with his wife to any more martial or nationalistic pursuits, and the description of their lifestyle, in their solitary tents or in their splendid palace, implies the erotic delights to be enjoyed there by the protagonists.¹¹⁴ In the meadow, before the episode with the 'δράκων', Digenes is lying asleep while the girl sprinkles him with rosewater, and when this is interrupted by the attacks of the 'dragon' and the lion, Digenes plays the lute while Eudokia

112. *GRO* III,329. For an example of erotic description in Arabic works, see *The Ring of the Dove*, 68-70. Von Grunebaum, *The Arab Contribution to Troubadour Poetry*, 143, 'Sensuality though bridled is strongly in evidence — the Arab tradition of viewing love-experience in retrospect enables the poet to keep within rigorous standards of decency without forcing him into insincerity in the portrayal of his attitude'. 113. The Emir, for example, has a gaze full of love (*GRO* I,35) as does the young Irene, *AND* 135-8, 'τά μάτια της υπόμαυρα, ὡσάν ὑπογελοῦσαν,/ ἐστάζασιν τὸν ἔρωτα μὲ τὸ ἀναπέτασμά της,/ ἐγέμασιν γλυκύτητα ἐρωτικῶν χαρίτων/ καὶ πάντοτε εἰς ἔρωτα ἦσαν παραδομένα'.

114. See Littlewood, *Romantic Paradises*, 95-114, esp.111f. For the role of gardens and meadows in Arabic poetry see von Grunebaum, 'The Response to Nature in Arabic poetry', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* (1945) 145-51 and 'Aspects of Arabic Urban Literature', *Islamic Studies* 8 (1969) 293; for the Islamic garden as part of celestial paradise, see *The Islamic Garden (Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium on the History of Landscape Architecture IV)*, ed. Elisabeth B. Macdougall and Richard Ettinghausen (Washington 1976) esp.13-39. For gardens and garden imagery in learned romance, see Littlewood, *Romantic Paradises*, 97-113; *Prod.* VI,291-305; *Eug.* IV,276-9,330-41; VI,566-71, VIII,84-130; *Makr.* II,7-9; IV,21-3; V,17.

sings a lovesong to his music.¹¹⁵ In their palace, the reader is again expected to conceive of the magnificent garden as a scene for dalliance, while within the palace the girl is accustomed to sing and dance delightfully.¹¹⁶ No other occupation is suggested for the couple but pleasure. 'Οὕτω διηγὼν χαίροντες καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν'.¹¹⁷

Like Digenes and Eudokia, the Emir and Irene live a secluded and pleasurable life. The depth of their passion is shown on their parting and reunion, for at their separation they fondly and endlessly kiss and embrace drenched with tears, despite the surrounding crowd,¹¹⁸ the Emir sings a love-song on his departure emphasizing the haste with which he will travel and the speed with which he will return under whatever adverse conditions to his beloved, and he arrives home to a rapturous reunion with Irene, during which both faint, entwined with each other, and have to be revived with water. Once recovered, they turn to kisses and sweet endearments,¹¹⁹ and such passionate scenes recur

115. *GRO* VI,42f.; VI,15-44,100-8; *ESC* 1139-50 (cf. *AND* 2833-83); see *GRO* VI,105-8, 'Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ ἔρωτι γλυκύν δόντι μοι κύρκαν,/ καὶ χαίρω βασιλεύουσα, μηδένα φοβουμένη,/ κρίνον ὑπάρχει εὐθαλές, μῆλον μεμυρισμένον,/ καὶ ὡς ῥόδον πανεύοισμον θέλγει μου τὴν καρδίαν' (cf. *AND* 2955-61).

116. *GRO* VII,8-41; *ESC* 1618-94; cf. *AND* 3904-31. The garden has the usual features of a wall, a river, fruits, flowers, and birds of all kinds. For Eudokia, see *GRO* VII,160-73 (*AND* 4200-12) and for music and dancing girls see *GRO* IV,890-2. In *AND* 4232, they even had the delights of a 'λουτρό' together, and an exotic bath was also built for Irene as a child (*AND* 114-21). For the bath as an erotic feature of later romance, see *Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe*, ll.787-804, for which see below n. 179.

117. *GRO* VII,159. Although Digenes is said to have done many martial deeds (*GRO* IV,968-70; VII,5f.,193-229; *ESC* 1609-14,1688-92; cf. *AND* 3892-8,4285-357), in current versions of the work he instigates nothing after his marriage, but only fights when provoked by an attack on Eudokia. See *ESC* 1299-1301, for his reply to Philopappos' offer of partnership, 'ἐγὼ μονογενὴς εἰμαι καὶ μόνος θέλω δευεῖν/ καὶ μόνην κόρην ἔλαβα καὶ τίποτα οὐ χρήζω./ Ποτέ μου οὐκ ἐσυνήθισα ἀνδραγαθεῖν με ἄλλους'; cf., for his desire for solitude and lack of social commitment, *GRO* IV,956-9; (referring to his elopement) IV,374.

118. *GRO* II,263-70,280-6; *TRE* 1030-36 (Mavrogordato, *Digenes Akrites*, 82); *ESC* 467-81; cf. *AND* 884-906. Irene's gift of a ring as a love token to the Emir is paralleled by Eudokia's gift to Digenes, *GRO* IV,364f. (cf. *AND* 1778f.).

119. *GRO* III,22-6; *ESC* 487-93; cf. *AND* 911-4. Compare the love songs of Digenes, *GRO* IV,256-8,401-4,432-5; *ESC* 839-43,847-51 (cf. *AND* 1677-9,1844-8,1866-71). For the Emir's return to Irene, see *GRO* III,288-93, 'ἐφίλει γὰρ ὁ ἀμνηρᾶς τοὺς

elsewhere in the romance.¹²⁰ Digenes and Eudokia indulge in similar behaviour during the course of their elopement, first when Eudokia jumps from the window into his arms, then after Digenes defeats the force sent against him,¹²¹ and finally before he takes her to his home.¹²² In all these kissing scenes Eudokia is a willing participant, and their future is one given over to the joys of love; indeed all nature joins in the celebrations.¹²³ This loving relationship continues after marriage,¹²⁴ all their expectations of joy are fulfilled, and they live many years in mutual happiness.¹²⁵

The two extra-marital affairs in which Digenes is involved are more illustrative of lust than of love and provide a more explicit, if less romantic or idealised, description of sexual relationships than that given in the portrayal of the protagonists' marriages. The daughter of Haplorrabdes, who eloped with her father's prisoner having despoiled her father of much wealth and portable property while her mother lay dying, is quite specific about

ὄφθαλμούς τῆς κόρης,/ περιπλέκετο αὐτήν, μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἡρώτα:/ 'Πῶς ἔχεις, φῶς μου τὸ γλυκύ, πάντερπνόν μου δαμάλιν;/ πῶς ἔχεις, φίλτατε ψυχῇ, ἐμὴ παραμυθία,/ περιστερὰ μου πάντερπνε, πανώραιόν μου δένδρον,/ μετὰ τοῦ σοῦ ἀνθήματος, τέκνου τοῦ παμποθήτου;'. Cf. *ESC* 583-5; *AND* 1237-47. For other examples of endearments or expressions of love as in the love-songs see *GRO* IV,765-7; *ESC* 833-51; *AND* 1959-74,2164,2955-7. Many of these endearments have an obviously erotic significance; for the apple see A.R. Littlewood, 'The Symbolism of the Apple in Byzantine Literature', *JōB* 23 (1974) 48f.

120. Cf. *GRO* III,127-9, where the Emir is lovingly kissed by his harem.

121. *GRO* IV,588-91; *ESC* 912-6 (cf. *AND* 1991-3); *GRO* IV,649-52, 'καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἵππου καταβάς καὶ μυρία φιλήσας:/ "Ἐχεις με, κόρη πάντερπνε, ἀπόδειξιν τῶν ἔργων;'. 'Ἡ δὲ κόρη τὸν ἄγουρον ὠραῖζουσα πλέον,/ ἡδέας ὑπεδέχετο φίλημάτων τοὺς ψόφους;'

122. *GRO* IV,783f., 'φιλήματός τε καθαροῦ ἡδέως κορεσθέντες/ καὶ χαίροντες διώδευον μεθ' ἡδονῆς μεγάλης;'

123. *GRO* IV,832-40; *ESC* 1061f.; cf. *AND* 2238-42.

124. *GRO* VI,170, after Digenes defeats Philopappos and his gang, who try to abduct Eudokia, she washes him with rosewater while he calms her fears, 'καὶ μυρία φιλήσαντες ἤλθομεν εἰς τὴν τένδαν.' There is then a suggestive gap until the next day (cf. *AND* 3016-7); for their kisses see also *ESC* 1593f.; *AND* 3029,3826.

125. As even the reivers wish for them, *GRO* VI,305-7; cf. *AND* 2806-7. Their only regret is childlessness, *GRO* VII,179-82. It is presumably the fact that Irene and Eudokia are married to their lovers that permits them an open, un-Byzantine demonstrativeness in their affections, not displayed by the heroines of twelfth century romance who are restricted to the conventionally modest behaviour of young unmarried girls.

the relationship she enjoyed with her treacherous 'Roman' lover who had promised to marry her, but after a brief period of romance deserted her: 'καὶ τρεῖς ἀναπαυσάμενοι ἡμέρας τε καὶ νύκτας,/ ἐρωτικὰς μεταβολὰς τελοῦντες ἀκορέστως'.¹²⁶ Digenes' own assault on the girl, who has thus outraged the bounds of female modesty and propriety, is powerfully understated and not explicitly narrated, nor does Digenes appear to feel guilt or remorse for his brutal action, except in so far as he has transgressed against Eudokia as his wife,¹²⁷ while the affair with Maximo, herself a most willing partner, is clearly described, his subsequent return and murder of her highlighting the view of the danger of uncontrolled female sexuality.¹²⁸ As far as Digenes is concerned, all the circumstances are so adapted as to further not his heroic deeds, but his love affair with Eudokia, and the descriptions first of the meadow and then of the palace and garden in which they dwell have a decidedly sensuous effect. The seclusion too of the girls, Irene and Eudokia, has an erotic edge to it. Love, for the couples around whom this romance revolves, is an intrinsic element of their marriage and of their lives, spent in a paradisiacal setting with idyllic features and far from the problems of the real world.

Unlike the heroines of the twelfth century novel, who show themselves at least the equals of their lovers in initiative and decisiveness (not that that is much) and play as important a part

126. *GRO* V, 112f. (cf. *AND* 2598-9). Galatariotou, *Structural Oppositions*, 58, 'As a transgressor of the female norm, Haplorrabdes' daughter is a rebel towards patriarchal authority'.

127. *GRO* V, 242-56 (cf. *AND* 2758-67). See Galatariotou, *Structural Oppositions*, 63f. for evidence of tensions and mistrust between Digenes and the Girl in *GRO*.

128. *GRO* VI, 777-85 (cf. *AND* 3792-821). The version of *ESC* (1561-78) is very abrupt (1575f.), 'Καὶ ἐπέξευσα τὸν μαῦρον μου καὶ λύω τ' ἄρματα μου/ καὶ τὸ ἐπεθύμα ἢ Μαξιμοῦ γοργὸν τῆς τὸ ἐποίηκα'. Compare *GRO* VI, 782-5, 'καὶ ὁ χιτὼν τῆς Μαξιμοῦς ὑπῆρχεν ἀραχνώδης,/ πάντα καθάπερ ἔσοπτρον ἐνέφαινε τὰ μέλη,/ καὶ τοὺς μαστοὺς προκύπτοντας μικρὸν ἄρτι τῶν στέρνων./ Καὶ ἐτρώθη μου ἡ ψυχὴ, ὡραία γὰρ ὑπῆρχε.' M.J. Jeffreys *Digenis Akritas Manuscript Z*, 173, n. 2, points out that *Z* softens the crudity of Maximo's offer of herself to Digenes, in accordance with the changes due to the manuscript's moral tone elsewhere: see *AND* 3803-5, 'Χαίροις δεσπότης ὁ ἐμός, ἐπάνω μου δραμοῦσα/ δούλη σου ὄντως γέγονα τῇ τοῦ πολέμου τύχῃ./ Καὶ χεῖρα μου τὴν δεξιάν ἡδέως κατεφίλει'; and cf. *ibid.*, 3810-2.

in instigating the love affair and participating in the subsequent action, Eudokia plays a more passive role, and, as her usual name 'the Girl' implies, is important because she is the girl whom Digenes loves rather than because of any distinct characterisation in her own right, and her role in the work is to motivate heroic action by Digenes for her rescue and protection and to provide an erotic element in her scenes of dalliance with her husband. The work also differs from the Byzantine novel in the difference of latitude allowed to hero and heroine. Of the two opportunities given to Digenes to indulge in extra-marital sex, he takes advantage of both with little or no hesitation, even though the work shows him as ashamed of his actions in retrospect. Eudokia's role as heroine in contrast is much diminished. In addition, it is significant that in this romance the narrative of the lovers' adventures does not end with marriage, which merely serves as the commencement of the lovers' relationship which lasts until death. The tales of both Irene and the Emir and Digenes and Eudokia continue after marriage, and this is a distinct departure from the ancient novel, and from Byzantine learned romance. It is perhaps to be assumed that in the ancient novel the lovers have no career after marriage but their relationship with each other, which is all important, but in *Digenes Akrites* not only is any prolonged contact between the unmarried couple unthinkable, but the marital relationship is not in itself considered to be sufficient occupation for a hero, though to Digenes himself, in the versions of the work which are extant, the hours of dalliance with his girl are of more importance than other, more heroic or altruistic, activities,¹²⁹ and this may doubtless represent both social conditions on the borders and the mentality and priorities of the Byzantine military aristocracy, themselves influenced in literary tastes and conventions by interaction with Arab culture. The romance enshrines the ideals and fantasies of an aristocratic society: heroism, adventure, wealth, military prowess, erotic dalliance, chastity (for women) and a sensuous landscape with no obtrusive responsibilities — a world perhaps not too far

129. For the traces of a more martial tradition in which Digenes is both a great warrior and a peace-maker, see n. 117 above.

removed from social reality, for those fortunate enough to enjoy such a lifestyle.

If the learned romances represent the fantasies of a scholarly intelligentsia, and *Digenes Akrites* those of a military and aristocratic élite, the popular verse romances perhaps reflect the morality of the common man triumphant.¹³⁰ These romances were created, like *Digenes*, in a bi-cultural milieu, only in this case apparently owing much to Frankish influence,¹³¹ together with other vernacular works, some lacking in love-interest, others showing the appeal that love-themes had for their audience. Of those adapted or translated from Western European originals notably important are the Arthurian fragment the *Old Knight*,¹³²

130. For a general survey of the vernacular romances and their milieu see M.J. Jeffreys, 'The Literary Emergence of Vernacular Greek', *Mosaic* 8 (1975) 171-93; n. 143 below.

131. See Jeffreys, *ibid.*, 189f. For social interaction between the two cultures, see D. Jacoby, 'The Encounter of Two Societies: Western Conquerors and Byzantines in the Peloponnese after the Fourth Crusade', *AHR* 78 (1973) 873-906; Denis A. Zakythinos, *Le despotat grec de Morée: vie et institutions* (London 1975) esp. 1-45, 146-226; Peter Topping, 'Co-Existence of Greeks and Latins in Frankish Morea and Venetian Crete', *XVe Congrès international d'études byzantines I* (Athens 1976) 3-23 (= *Studies on Latin Greece A.D. 1205-1715* (Variorum, London 1977) XI); and George Ostrogorsky, *Pour l'histoire de la féodalité byzantine* (Brussels 1954). In general, Greek-speaking lands under the control of westerners are hypothesized as the most logical places for these 'adaptations' to have originated. For a general discussion, see Börje Knös, 'A propos de l'influence française sur la littérature néohellénique du moyen âge', *Mélanges de Philologie Romane offerts à M. Karl Michaëlsson* (Göteborg 1952) 281-91; Johannes Irmscher, 'Les origines de la littérature populaire néo-grecque dans les îles ioniennes', *BF* 5 (1979) 147-57; J.B. Bury, *Romances of Chivalry on Greek Soil* (Oxford 1911) 4, 'it was a matter of course that the new literature of the twelfth century. . . the Provençal romances of adventure and the tales of the Arthurian cycle, should have circulated at the courts of the barons who ruled in Hellenic lands'. For Greek borrowings of Frankish feudal terms in the Morea and elsewhere, such as ὀρνάτωρ, κουρτεσία, ντάμα, λίχιος and φέε, see Henry, Renée Kahane, 'The Western Impact on Byzantium: the Linguistic Evidence', *DOP* 36 (1982-3) 127-53.

132. An undated fragment of some 307 lines (of probably the end of the 13th. century) adapted into archaizing language from the beginning of the compilation of Rusticiano da Pisa on the Arthurian cycle; see P. Breillat, 'La table ronde en Orient: le poème grec du Vieux Chevalier', *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École Française de Rome* 55 (1938) 308-40; P. Speck, 'Der "Schriftsteller" Palamedes', *JÖB* 18 (1969) 89-99; Beck, *Geschichte*, 138, K. Mitsakis' suggestion ('Palamedes', *BZ* 59 (1966) 5-7) that this might be the tip of a submerged Arthurian cycle was refuted by Elizabeth M. Jeffreys, 'Further Notes on Palamedes', *BZ* 61 (1968) 251-3. This

the lengthy love and adventure epic the *War of Troy*,¹³³ the *Theseid*, which similarly demonstrates the interest in tales of love, heroism, tournaments and the rhetoric of lovers in literary circles of the late fifteenth century,¹³⁴ and the popular tale of *Apollonios of Tyre*,¹³⁵ to which may be added the *Troas* and

piece, which shows that themes of love and adventure were certainly of interest to the general public, deals with the adventure of Brannor le Brun, the old knight and giant, who comes to the court of King Arthur and duels with the most renowned of his knights (Palamedes, Gawain, Tristan and Lancelot). While the fragment dwells primarily on the jousting, the old knight is accompanied by a beautiful girl who is to be the prize for the victor.

133. A faithful 14th. century translation of the whole of Benoît de Ste. Maure's c.30-000 line romance *Roman de Troie* (composed c.1165 and dedicated to Eleanor of Aquitaine) into 14,369 political verses as 'Ο Πόλεμος τῆς Τρωάδος. For its sources see Elizabeth M. Jeffreys, 'The Judgement of Paris in Late Byzantine Literature', *B* 48 (1978) 115-7 and 'The Manuscripts and Sources of the War of Troy', *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines. Bucharest 1971* 3 (Bucharest 1976) 91-4. For a discussion of the work as a transitional text between oral and literary composition, see E.M., M.J. Jeffreys, 'The Traditional Style of Early Demotic Greek Verse', *BMGS* 5 (1979) 115-39, updated in 'The Style of Byzantine Popular Poetry: Recent Work', *Okeanos: Essays Presented to Ihor Ševčenko (Harvard Ukrainian Studies VII; Cambridge Mass. 1984)* 316, 'Our minds have been changed by editing the huge romance, the *War of Troy*, which has five major manuscripts and two substantial fragments. Its more than 14,000 lines are a fairly close translation. . . and can only result from a single act of translation made in a purely literary way from text to text'; Beck, *Geschichte*, 138f. For an edition in preparation (E.M. Jeffreys, M. Papatomopoulos), see M. Papatomopoulos, 'L' édition critique du Πόλεμος τῆς Τρωάδος: problèmes méthodologiques', in *Neograeca Medii Aevi, Text und Ausgabe*, ed. H. Eideneier (Cologne 1987) 279-84.

134. For the close Cretan translation of Boccaccio's *Teseide* dated probably to the late fifteenth century, and a partial transcription and study of the printed edition of 1529, see Frederick Henry Marshall, 'The Greek Theseid', *BZ* 30 (1929-30) 131-42; E. Follieri, 'La versione in greco volgare del Teseida del Boccaccio', *Studi Bizantini e Neellenici* 7 (1953) 67-77; G. Spadaro, 'Sul Teseida neogreco', *Folia Neohellenica* 2 (1977) 157-60; Beck *Geschichte*, 139f.; Gareth Morgan, 'Cretan Poetry: Sources and Inspiration', *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 14 (1960) 253-70. The *Theseid*, which consists of twelve books and over twelve hundred lines, bears great resemblance to the *Erotokritos* in theme and expression, as, for example, in the long laments of the lovers and the lengthy descriptions of a great tournament and may possibly have influenced Kornaros. Certainly it is witness to the degree of popularity enjoyed by prolix and stereotyped tales of love and adventure during the fifteenth century and later despite the fact that in the printed version the publishers 'tried to change its popular language into a jargon that must have been acceptable only to the most arrant pedants. . . It was not a complete aesthetic failure, though its faults are egregious and painful' (*ibid.*, 263).

135. On the Byzantine adaptation (c.1400) of the Hellenistic romance of Apollonios of Tyre, thirteen editions of which were printed between 1534 and 1805, and its possible

Alexander poems for neither of which a prototype in Western European literature has been traced.¹³⁶ Besides these, the six verse romances represent the escapism of a popular culture — romance for everyman — which shows much greater laxity of morality than its predecessors in Byzantine romance. Of works apart from the verse romances, the *Troas* is certainly here the most relevant to the discussion of morality in vernacular romance, for, in addition to its romantic subject matter, unlike the other works it follows not a literary model but a jumble of amorphous legends at the discretion of the poet-narrator, and betrays a typically popular interest in illicit love and courtly life within a milieu reminiscent of the verse romances. This mélange of stories includes the visit of Paris, exiled from Troy, to Sparta disguised as a monk, where he seduces Helen and flees with her to Troy once she becomes pregnant. Helen is of course more beautiful than any other woman in the world, and renowned for her charms. Surrounded by the trappings of imperial majesty, and possessed of the power of conquering all hearts at first sight, she is fought for by all the kings of the world, and finally won by Menelaos. When Paris, shipwrecked, and dressed as a monk arrives there, he is soon spotted as a man of noble birth, reclathed, and breaks lances with them all, being of course undefeated, whereupon Helen at one glance is infatuated. Her music and playing, in which Paris is equally if not more adept, enraptures him, and during Menelaos' absence they carry on their affair for four months. Helen then becomes pregnant and they decide to flee to Troy, Helen disguised in men's clothes. It is clear indeed that Helen is the initiator of

links with the *Apollonio di Tiro* of Antonio Pucci, see Morgan, *Cretan Poetry*, 379-93; G. Kechagioglou, 'Γιά μιὰ νέα έκδοση του Απολλώνιου. Παρατηρήσεις και προτάσεις', *Neograeca Medii Aevi*, ed. Eideneier, 179-203; Beck, *Geschichte*, 133-8; for the latest edition of the two principal Latin recensions, and the history and transmission of the romance, see G.A.A. Kortekaas, *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* (Gröningen 1984).

136. For the *Troas*, an anonymous version of the legends concerning Troy, probably composed at a later date than the *War of Troy* and with little if no connection with it in subject matter, see the edition of L. Nørgaard, O.L. Smith, *A Byzantine Iliad, The Text of Par. Suppl. Gr.926* (Copenhagen 1975). For the Alexander romance, a popular version of the romance of Pseudo-Kallisthenes, see Beck, *Geschichte*, 133-5.

the affair,¹³⁷ and that the tone of the work is entirely medieval and typical of the romance tastes of the time, tending to the more pragmatic outlook, quite alien to the rhetoric of learned romance, as, for example, when the lovers, newly met, ponder how they might arrange a suitable assignation (‘πῶς νὰ ἔβρουν τόπον ἴδιον, πῶς νὰ ἔβρουν μοναξία/ καὶ νὰ πληρώσουν γλυκασμὸν ἀλλήλως τοῦ ἐρώτου;’), nor does this work present any more analytical view of sexual relationships than the verse romances, Paris acting to some degree, but rather perfunctorily, like a love-sick swain and courtly lover.¹³⁸ The poet-narrator has clearly modelled his subject matter to the popular demand of his audience, as the emphasis on romance motifs makes clear, and the theme of adultery, handled with courtly overtones, gives the romance a strong resemblance to the tone of Western European works.¹³⁹ While it is possible that by the fourteenth century moral standards were easing, as is certainly apparent in popular literature of the period,¹⁴⁰ it would perhaps be too bold a state-

137. *Troas* 651-60, 661-5, 692-7. Cf. the daughter of Haplorrabdes, her disguise in men's clothing, and her flight from home and disregard of social and moral values. For Helen's fear on discovering her pregnancy and of her husband's anger, see *ibid.*, 724-33. 138. *Troas*, 696f.: 682-5 Paris plays to Helen: ‘γονατιστὰ δουλωτικά ὁ Πάρις ἐπροσκύνα,/ ὁ Πάρις ἐπροσκύνησεν καὶ τὸ παιγνίδιν παίξει/ παράξενα καὶ εὐμορφα ἀλλότριον παιγνίδιν,/ καὶ διπλοτριπλοέρωτας ἐσέβη στὴν ψυχὴν της. . .’. The secrecy and concealment necessary in the relationship is also stressed, 663f., 727. Cf. 714-20, where after the consummation of their relationship (‘ἔποικεν, ἐπεπλήρωσε τὰ τοῦ φρικτοῦ τοῦ Ἑρῶν’) he tells her that he has entered Paradise, that he was before as if blind, is walking on air, and feels like ruler of the world. The poet is also aware of the affair of Briseis and Chryseis (805-49), and has brought in the scene of Achilles in girl's clothes (850-77), a transposition from his stay on Skyros as a youth, and in reducing nine years of the war to 7 lines (878-84), has given the setting especially the Greek camp a flavour of a medieval tournament rather than a full-scale and bloody war.

139. Nørgaard, Smith, *Byzantine Iliad*, 8, ‘Like the Byzantine Achilleid this is essentially an exploitation of a Homeric hero in the framework of the Byzantine romance. But unlike the Byzantine Achilles the Paris of our πόλεμος is always recognisable as an elaboration of the classical figure’. It is however true that the work shows very decidedly medieval overtones, and Paris in his jousting, musical skill and amorous nature is little akin to his classical predecessor.

140. For a certain freedom of morals and frankness about sexual matters which becomes apparent in the 14th century, see Angeliki E. Laiou, ‘The Role of Women in Byzantine Society’, *JÖB* 31/1 (1981) 259. This increased frankness, which already appears in the epic-romance *Digenes Akrites*, is evident primarily in popular literature,

ment to imply that these romances more closely reflect social reality and it may well be the case that Western influence inspired a loosening both of conventional literary standards and of the morality presented in such works,¹⁴¹ and this difference in tone must at least in part be attributed to the influence of or contact with Western European romance traditions. Certainly these Byzantine popular romances would hardly have been reiterated in such stereotyped forms — for like their predecessors in learned romance these works too have not escaped criticism¹⁴² — had not this literary form and its concepts and themes (including those

such as the *Διήγησις τοῦ Πωρικολόγου*, ed. Wilhelm Wagner, *Carmina Graeci Medii Aevi* (Leipzig 1874) 199–202; the *Παιδιόφραστος διήγησις τῶν ζῶων τῶν τετραπόδων*, ed. V. Tsiouni (Munich 1972) and the *Πουλλόλογος*, ed. Isabella Tsavaris (Athens 1987), and the eroticism and sexual innuendo in these texts can not be attributed to the Western European influences which may have affected the increased freedom of morals in the popular verse romances. Eroticism was however an important feature of 12th century romance and it is significant that the most Byzantine verse romance, *Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe*, contains the greatest degree of erotic innuendo, though conventional standards of morality are upheld. But the early 15th. century satire, *Mazaris' Journey to Hades* (Arethusa Monographs V; Buffalo 1975), in which liaisons with prostitutes and love affairs are recounted with vigour, describes behaviour which contravenes all Byzantine conventions and standards of sexual morality.

141. E.M. Jeffreys, *The Comnenian Background*, 483, 'It seems to me very probable that it was an awareness of the literary vigour of the vernaculars in the West that loosened Byzantine stylistic conventions'.

142. Beck, *Marginalia*, 64, calls them 'a very fourteenth century-like flight from the gloomy present into the world of fairy tales'; Elizabeth M. Jeffreys, 'The Later Greek Verse Romances: a Survey', *Byzantina Australiensia* 1 (1981) 118, 'You will be disappointed if you turn to them for a delicate use of language, for subtle delineation of character or deep insights into human emotion. You will find instead conventionally improbably plots, brightly coloured but cardboard scenery, couched in the jog-trot rhythms of the political verse with a repetitious vocabulary'; and see E.M., M.J. Jeffreys, *The Traditional Style*, 139 for the lack of literary originality in plot and use of language in Byzantine popular poetry as a whole. But see Beaton, *The Greek Novel*, 136f., 'Originality, naturalness of language, plot, characterisation are all increasingly being seen as the aesthetic yardsticks of a particular time and place. . . The task of the historian of literature ought then to be, not to apply the aesthetic criteria of his own time to the literature of the past, but rather to seek to extrapolate from the surviving texts the somewhat different aesthetic criteria that must have determined their production and reception'. For the relationship between learned and popular romance in Byzantium and their common features, see I. Sevcenko, 'Society and Intellectual Life in the Fourteenth Century', *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines* (Bucharest 1974) 76–9; Johannes Irmscher, 'Der byzantinische Roman', *Das Altertum* 30 (1984) 247–51; E.M., M.J. Jeffreys, *The Style of Byzantine Popular Poetry*, 338f.

of sexual morality) been to the taste of its public. Any loosening of moral tone may also be due to the development of popular literature and its prevalence by the fourteenth century and later, with its more fluid and anonymous transmission.¹⁴³ These works at the least provide evidence for popular expectations of romance and the behaviour of lovers in fantasy literature in the vernacular, however much it might differ from conventional moral standards. Indeed the fact that copyists and redactors have thought it necessary in several cases to impose quite arbitrarily incongruous or unrealistic standards of sexual morality on the protagonists of these works makes clear the fact that certain features of these works were considered by their copyists or narrators to transgress contemporary conventional mores prior to this interference.¹⁴⁴

143. For the most recent discussion of the works' transmission, see *ibid.*, 309-43. The definitive works on the tradition are their studies: M.J. Jeffreys, 'Formulas in the Chronicle of the Morea', *DOP* 27 (1973) 165-95 and 'The Nature and Origins of the Political Verse', *DOP* 28 (1974) 141-95; E.M., M.J. Jeffreys, *The Traditional Style*, 115-39. For a discussion of the oral tradition in the verse romances, see E.M., M.J. Jeffreys, 'Imberios and Margarona': the Manuscripts, Sources and Edition of a Byzantine Verse Romance', *B* 41 (1971) 122-60; Margaret Alexiou, David Holton, 'The Origins and Development of "Politikos Stichos"', *Mantatophoros* 9 (1976) 22-34; E.M. Jeffreys, *The Later Greek Verse Romances*, 120-123. For *Digenes Akrites*, see Beaton, *Was Digenes Akrites an Oral Poem?*, 7-27, and, for the signs of oral performance in the ESC MS, see Morgan, *Cretan Poetry*, 44-68.

144. In general, the romances are assigned to the 14th. century; E.M. Jeffreys, *The Later Greek Verse Romances*, 118. For the MSS tradition see E.M., M.J. Jeffreys, *The Style of Byzantine Popular Poetry*, 333-43 (*ibid.*, 343, '... it would be highly significant to discover that most of our surviving manuscripts were written around 1500 outside Greek-speaking lands, based on prototypes written within Greek lands a century or more earlier'); for the MSS tradition of *Digenes Akrites*, see M.J. Jeffreys, *Digenis Akritas Manuscript Z*, 163-201. Sources, editions and studies until 1971 for the popular verse romances are given by Beck, *Geschichte*, 115-153; a bibliography from 1971 to 1979 is given by Elizabeth M. Jeffreys, 'The Popular Byzantine Verse Romances of Chivalry: Work since 1971', *Mantatophoros* 14 (1979) 20-34, and for earlier work see also Otto Mazal, 'Der griechische und byzantinische Roman in der Forschung von 1945 bis 1960', *JöBG* 14 (1965) 83-124. Editions here used are: *Le roman de Callimaque et de Chrysorrhoe* (hereafter *KC*), ed. and trans. Michel Pichard (Paris 1956); *Le roman de Phlorios et Platzia Phlore*, ed. D.C. Hesseling (Amsterdam 1917) (hereafter *PP*); Belthandros and Chrysantza (hereafter *BC*), ed. Emmanuel Kriaras, *Βυζαντινὰ Ἱπποτικά Μυθιστορήματα* (Βασικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη 2; Athens 1955) 101-27; Imberios and Margarona (hereafter *IM*) ed. Kriaras, *ibid.*, 215-232; *L'Achilléide Byzantine* (hereafter *Ach.*), ed. D.C. Hesseling (Amsterdam 1919); *Le roman de Libistros et Rhodamnè* (hereafter *LR*), ed. J.A. Lambert (Amsterdam 1935).

The heroines and the heroes of the popular verse romances, whether translated or without a prototype in Western European literature, are markedly more independent and active than their predecessors both in Byzantine romance and in *Digenes Akrites*, and although it is the case that both Rhodamne and the Girl of the *Achilleid* have a special secluded garden in which they grow up until Eros claims them for their own,¹⁴⁵ this setting does not imply so much that their actions or inclinations are in any way restricted, as that the heroine's surroundings should be appropriately exotic. The apparently semi-contemporary setting of the romances, despite hints of magic and the supernatural, with its social and geographical relationship to the world of their audience, in which the action is placed in a distant but not unrecognisable past primarily reminiscent of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries and reflecting echoes of crusader times, with the exception of Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe which is set in pagan times,¹⁴⁶ places the works in a more realistic, if exotic,

145. *Ach.*N 709-94; *LR* E 2448-510. The same topos is perhaps reflected in *BC* 832-68. Compare *KC* 280-90, 831-8, and cf. Chrysorrhoe's garden as queen, 1619ff. For the convention of the 'garden of love', see Littlewood, *Romantic Paradises*, 102-114. The topos also appears in the prologue to the Andros MS of *Digenes Akrites*, and see *GRO* VI, 15-41, VII, 13-108. For the significance of the 'hortus conclusus' in western romance and its sexual and social symbolism, see Paul Piehler, *The Visionary Landscape: a Study in Medieval Allegory* (London 1971) esp. 72ff.; for the motif of the castle in *KC*, *LR*, *BC*, see Cupane, *Il motivo del castello*, 236-46. See above ns. 59, 81, 116 for the topos in Byzantine romance and *Digenes Akrites*. Platziaphlora is confined in an exotic tower with other desirable maidens by the Emir of 'Babylon' (*PP* 1285-90) but for different reasons.

146. This romance has been generally considered to be the product of the Byzantine court the authorship being attributed to Andronikos Palaiologos, first cousin of Andronikos II; see also Ševčenko, *Intellectual Life*, 77, who follows Herbert Hunger, 'Un roman byzantin et son atmosphère: Callimaque et Chrysorrhoe', *Travaux et Mémoires* 3 (1968) 421f., while Magdalino, *Byzantine Snobbery*, 75, suggests the author to be the son of the sebastokrator Constantine Palaiologos. A date between 1310 and 1340 seems likely for its composition; see Pichard, *Le roman de Callimaque*, xxviii; Börje Knös, 'Qui est l'auteur du roman de Callimaque et de Chrysorrhoe?', *Ελληνικά* 17 (1962) 274-95. According to M.J. Jeffreys, *The Literary Emergence*, 188, 'its roots are in popular literature but most of its leaves and branches in the rarefied air of the court'; E.M., M.J. Jeffreys, *The Style of Byzantine Popular Poetry*, 340, '... only one poem, *Callimachos and Chrysorrhoe*, is likely to have been produced at the imperial court, and that, to judge from its low formulaic density and comparatively educated language, was some way from the living oral tradition'. For Meliteniotes' parody of such romances in his *Εἰς τὴν Σωφροσύνην*, see Cupane, *J*

world to which its public could relate. Chrysantza is a princess of Antioch; Imberios prince of Provence and Margaronia princess of Naples; the Phlorios romance is set in Muslim Spain and, like Libistros and Rhodamne (where, despite hints of pagan times, both the protagonists are apparently Latin 'royals'), involves a journey to Egypt, and Imberios like Platziaphlora is sold to an Eastern ruler,¹⁴⁷ which, as opposed to the learned romances' tradition of a geographically vague and pagan setting, perhaps implies not so much the demand for a more realistic description of the protagonists and their attitudes and reactions, whether to love, adventure or the supernatural, as the influence of Western European romance, in which the Orient and its exotic features were essential ingredients of nearly all fantasy literature in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.¹⁴⁸

Chastity as a necessary quality for heroines was an essential element of both the ancient novel and Byzantine romance, and the romance-epic *Digenes Akrites* maintained the convention, which is echoed to a degree, but certainly not religiously followed by the protagonists of the verse romances. Moreover, the degree

motivo del castello, 236-41, 246-67. See also Hunger, *Un roman byzantin*, 405-22; Inez Diller, 'Märchenmotive in Kallimachos und Chrysorrhoe', *Folia Neellenica* 2 (1977) 25-40. Beaton, *The Greek Novel*, 140, suggests that the element of magic in the romance results from contact with Western tradition, but such influence could equally well be argued to stem from Eastern folklore. Angold, *The Byzantine Empire*, 218, 'The demand for such [vernacular] literature was not popular in origin, but came from within the court; perhaps even from the emperor [Manuel Komnenos] himself, given that so much of the earliest literature in the vernacular is addressed to the emperor in person'. For an analysis of the language of the romance, see Ph. Apostolopoulos, *La langue du roman byzantin 'Callimaque et Chrysorrhoe'* (Athens 1984).

147. *BC* 386f.; *IM* 16-32, 262f.; Lambert, *Le roman de Libistros*, 41-8; see J. Loenertz, 'La belle Maguelonne ou le fondement historique d'un roman de chevalerie', *Thesaurismata* 13 (1976) 40-6, for the geographical and historical allusions in *IM* implying a primarily 12th century setting.

148. See Jean Richard, 'La vogue de l'Orient dans la littérature occidentale du Moyen-Age', in *Les relations entre l'Orient et l'Occident au Moyen Age* (Variorum, London 1977) XXI; Margaret Schlauck, 'The Palace of Hugon de Constantinople', *Speculum* 7 (1932) 500-9; Edmund Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romans courtois du moyen âge* (Paris 1913) esp. 307-77. The Byzantines too may have had a preference for the East, rather than the prosaic West, as a setting for romance and fantasy, as the two verse romances which are set in Western Europe are those that are in fact adaptation of Western originals.

of erotic description in the popular verse romances, with the possible exception of *Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe*, does not approach that found in the Byzantine learned romances, or indeed that of the ancient novel, perhaps because of the limitations imposed on the popular romances by conditions of transmission and performance. Whereas the learned romances specialise in erotic innuendo without the accompanying action, the popular romances in general prefer the action without the innuendo. It should perhaps be assumed that the two works which are known to be adapted from western models, particularly *Phlorios and Platziaphlora*, a faithful translation of the ever popular *Floire et Blancheflor*, should be closer to the more liberated morality of western romance,¹⁴⁹ and this work does in fact break with the Byzantine convention of maintaining strict morality for the lovers, until a wedding with full parental consent at the romance's conclusion. When Phlorios finally catches up with the abducted Platziaphlora, now immured in the Sultan of Babylon's harem, and is smuggled into the Emir's tower, the two lovers have no qualms about their conduct or propriety, send a message to the Emir that Platziaphlora is ill, and are subsequently discovered by him *in flagrante*, since, worried about the girl, he rushes there to find them enjoying a sweet sleep, erotically entwined. The romancer here makes no moral judgements whatsoever. Condemned to death, only Phlorios' magic ring saves their lives, and they celebrate in fact not one but two marriages at the end of the work, thus definitely regularising their position in the Greek version. The work ends with the delight of the king and queen, who had previously tried to part the lovers at any cost, including that of the seduction of Phlorios

149. *Phlorios and Platziaphlora* has as its prototype an Italian version of the far-reaching romance *Floire et Blanchefleur*. See Beck, *Geschichte*, 139-40. For the provenance and transmission of the western romance, see Roberto Giacone, 'Floris and Blanchefleur; Critical Issues', *Rivista di Studi Classici* 27 (1979) 395-405; G. Spadaro, *Contributo sulle fonti del romanzo greco medievale 'Florio e Platziaphlora'* (Athens 1966). For the ostensibly morally subversive doctrine of Courtly Love in Western Europe, see A.J. Denomy, 'Courtly Love and Courtliness', *Speculum* 28 (1953) 44, 'Since sexual love is represented as the sole source of man's ennoblement on earth, then its practice is incumbent on everyone. . . What is done, moreover, under Love's compulsion cannot be sinful or immoral'. For Marie de Champagne's statement, that love between husband and wife is impossible, see Andreas Capellanus, *De Arte Honeste Amandi*, 1,6 ed. E. Trojel, (Copenhagen 1892) 153.

by two young noble girls who willingly undertake the assignment, a plan, the morality of which is again not questioned in the work, which fails miserably owing to Phlorios' devotion to his love.¹⁵⁰ As far as erotic description is concerned, however, *Phlorios and Platziaphlora* sees little love-play between the hero and heroine because due to the exigencies of the plot they are separated for most of the work, and when Phlorios jousts on his love's behalf he is in disguise. The two young and beautiful girls commanded to seduce Phlorios, to distract his mind from Platziaphlora, and who promise to arouse him even should he be a corpse, fail miserably despite their jewels and finery, and he does not even speak or look at them, while the scene in which Platziaphlora wears her best clothes supposedly because of Phlorios' arrival, but which is merely a trick of the king and queen to display her charms to the merchants to whom they sell her, while realistically poignant, merely portrays her delight in dressing up for her lover. The only explicit scene takes place briefly in the Emir's tower, into which Phlorios is smuggled, appropriately in a basket of roses, and where he is discovered by the Emir in bed with Platziaphlora, the description of which is, however, brief and understated.¹⁵¹

More representative of Byzantine conventions and sexual morality is the story of *Imberios and Margarona*, although adapted from a Western European prototype. In the Greek version, in which the changes made to the original plot clearly show the less liberated moral standards of the Byzantine 'translator' who bowdlerises the text of any improper episodes, Margarona persuades her father to hold a joust, of which she will marry the winner, who of course turns out to be Imberios, the two of them having previously sworn eternal fidelity at their first, secret, meeting, and they are thereupon married with the full approval

150. *PP* 1664-7, 1780-2, 1787-9. If they succeed, the girls are promised husbands, *ibid.*, 795-7. For the Emir's chastity test, see *ibid.*, 1326-36. For the narrator's lack of criticism when the Emir discovers the lovers in bed together (1664f.), 'καὶ ἡ κόρη ἀντάμα ἐκέϊτετο μετὰ καὶ τοῦ Φλωρίου, / περιπλεμένη ἐρωτικά, καθὼς εἶχεν τὸ δίκαιον, / ὕπνον γλυκύν, γλυκύτατον ἐντάμα νὰ κοιμούνται. . .'.
151. *PP* 787-840, 955-71, 1634-46, 1664-7, 1682-7. When they are to be burnt at the stake he holds her tightly and the magic ring saves them both, *ibid.*, 1729.

of the king and queen. Only later, because Imberios is homesick, do the couple quietly leave Naples without the knowledge of Margarona's parents.¹⁵² In the model for this romance, *Pierre de Provence et la belle Maguelonne*, it is only through competing in a tournament that Pierre catches Maguelonne's attention, and the tournament is not to decide whom she should marry. Because her father has a suitable match for her already planned, the couple have to elope secretly and their sufferings then begin with their separation *en route*. Thus the second marriage in the Greek version, at the couple's reunion in Provence, is unnecessary, in contrast to the marriage of Pierre and Maguelonne at the end of the French work, which is an essential element of the ending and plot. The first marriage in the Greek, presumably inserted to comply with moral convention since it would be improper for them to elope together unmarried, makes nonsense both of the couple's elopement after reigning at Naples for over a year and of their second wedding.¹⁵³ *Imberios and Margarona* also underplays the sexual element in the story even more strongly than its prototype. When the couple actually meet, they exchange vows of eternal constancy but according to the work indulge in no love-play. Their marriage, and their discussion concerning their secret departure, is not made the occasion for a description of affectionate or demonstrative behaviour, and, when they are journeying, the motif for their separation is that Imberios hands Margarona his mother's amulet (then stolen by an eagle, who mistakes it for meat, whom Imberios pursues); in the French prototype, Imberios opens Margarona's garment to gaze at her beauty and an eagle takes the rings (his gifts) that she kept there.¹⁵⁴ In the Greek version she does, however, sleep on his knees. At their eventual recognition scene, Margarona merely falls tearfully on

152. *IM* 298-300, 304-16, 445-70. *Imberios and Margarona's* prototype is a version of *Pierre de Provence et la belle Maguelonne*. See Beck, *Geschichte*, 144f.; E.M., M.J. Jeffreys, *Imberios*, 122-60; Loenertz, *La belle Maguelonne*, 40-6.

153. E.M., M.J. Jeffreys, *Imberios*, 129-31; *IM* 889-91.

154. *IM* 298-300; *IM* 468-510, 536-44; E.M., M.J. Jeffreys, *Imberios*, 131. For this motif, see Jean Renard, *L'Escoufle*, ed. H. Michelant, P. Meyer (Paris 1984), in which an eagle steals a purse of red leather and is chased by the hero, Guillaume, which leads to the separation of the lovers.

his neck,¹⁵⁵ and this popular verse romance is certainly very discreet in its handling of the love interest.

In *Libistros and Rhodamne*, as in *Imberios*, chastity is once again maintained by the protagonists until marriage. The princess lives in a secluded garden, attended by eunuchs, and only the intervention of Eros, and a series of love-letters from Libistros persuade her to an emotional but decorous meeting with her lover. Rhodamne humbly asks her father to let the two rival suitors joust for her hand, and clearly states her preference, throwing Libistros her token at the tournament which he wears with pride. As a result of his victory, he is proclaimed 'βασιλεύς' and they are at once married with pomp and ceremony.¹⁵⁶ When Rhodamne is abducted by Libistros' rival Berderichos, the king of Egypt, she, like Chrysorrhoe, maintains chastity and perpetual lamentation until she is rescued by her lover four years later. Berderichos' intentions meanwhile had been strictly honourable.¹⁵⁷ The secondary character, Klitovos, also seems more of a courtly lover. Punished by exile for loving a lady, a married woman, by her hostile father, he returns and, finding her a widow, marries her, his former wife, the very self-effacing and uncharacterized sister of Rhodamne, Melanthia, whom he married at Libistros' suggestion, having died.¹⁵⁸ Of the verse romances, it is *Libistros and Rhodamne* which possesses the most complex narrative structure, and its ecphrases in the manner and taste of Makrembolites proclaim, despite the evidence of western influence in its descriptions of the life-style of its protagonists, its debt to Byzantine culture. But while it conforms to Byzantine conventions of behaviour and sexual morality, in that chastity is maintained by both hero and heroine, it greatly underplays the actual love affair and there is little contact described between the protagonists, presumably because the entire romance is being narrated at second hand by Klitovos repeating Libistros' story, as Libistros told

155. *IM* 531f.; *IM* 839-44 (also in the French, E.M., M.J. Jeffreys, *loc.cit*).

156. *LR* S1312-69, E2448-510; *LR* S1100-16, E2179-216; *LR* E2261-80, S1159-78 (cf. *IM* 306-16); *LR* S1189f., E2291f. (cf. *IM* 376-7); *LR* E2333-78, S1228-72.

157. *LR* S2135-46, E3315-27, S2168-264, E3351-447; *LR* S2154-62, E3337-44.

158. *LR* S1474-520, E2617-67, S2307-72, E3496-557, S3236-62, E4379-4407; *LR* S3203-36, E4350-76.

it to him, to his love Myrtane. This romance employs long rhetorical speeches and prolix expressions of love, which are a feature of Byzantine learned romance also, but without, however, simultaneously employing the erotic innuendo, so ubiquitous in these works, to direct and heighten the reader's interest. When Libistros and Rhodamne eventually meet after a lengthy correspondence conducted at long distance, they greet each other formally and only after statements of their mutual regard do they embrace, in a scene which Libistros specifically refuses to describe, though the joys of their meeting are implied and left to the imagination of the hearer, while later he kisses her when they part.¹⁵⁹ The formal ecphrasis on her beauty emphasizes her manifold attractions, but the romancer ignores their mutual pleasures and avoids portraying even the most innocent demonstrative behaviour between hero and heroine; even at their reunion in Egypt, after four years of separation, they are shown as spending more time fainting than kissing and embracing.¹⁶⁰

The romance of *Belthandros and Chrysantza*, despite its Greek features and the fact that no specific model for it in Western Europe has been discovered,¹⁶¹ relates closely to the sexual morality of *Phlorios* and to the conventions of western romance in general. Belthandros, after seeing Chrysantza's statue in the Erotokastron, and learning his fate, arrives at Antioch and enters

159. *LR* E2185-216, S1099-118; E2212-6, 'γνωρίζεις ἂν ἐννοηθοῦν δύο ὁποῦ ἀγαποῦσιν,/ τί ἐσυνέβηκε, λοιπὸν συχνοπατῶ τα πλεό,/ τὸ πῶς ἐπεριπλέκαμε καὶ μετὰ πόθου ποιού,/ καὶ πόσα ἐσυνετύχαμεν,καὶ πόσες ὑποθέσεις,/ ἀφίνω τα, οὐκ εἶναι πρόσωρα τοῦ νὰ σὲ τάφηγοῦμαι'; *LR* E2242, S1141.

160. *LR* E2383-434; E3831-68, S2665-712.

161. See especially D.C. Hesseling, 'Le roman de Belthandros et Chrysantza', *Neophilologus* 23 (1938) 375-9; H. Schreiner, 'Zerrissene Zusammenhänge und Fremdkörper im Belthandros-Text', *BZ* 52 (1959) 257-64; D. Chatzes, 'Τὰ ἑλληνικὰ στοιχεῖα στὸ μυθιστόρημα Διήγησις ἐξαίρετος Βελθάνδρου τοῦ Ρωμαίου', *Berliner Byzantinistische Arbeiten* 16 (1960) 93-111; Emmanuel Kriaras, 'Παρατηρήσεις στὸ κείμενο τοῦ μυθιστορήματος 'Βελθάνδρος καὶ Χρυσάντζα'', *Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici* 9 (1957) 237-49; Herbert Hunger, 'Die Schönheitskonkurrenz in 'Belthandros und Chrysantza' und die Brautschau am Byzantinischen Kaiserhof', *B* 35 (1965) 150-8; Henry, Renée Kahane, 'The Hidden Narcissus in the Byzantine Romance of *Belthandros and Chrysantza*', *JöB* 33 (1983) 199-219; Cupane, 'Ερωὸς βασιλεὺς', 282-97, and *Il motivo del castello*, 242-6. Whatever the roots and origins of this romance the behaviour of the protagonists is alien to the Byzantine tradition and shows the intermixture of Frankish culture and values.

the service of her father. After twenty-six months of silence about their mutual passion, Belthandros overhears Chrysantza soliloquizing about her passion for him, and leaps into her private garden whereupon they commence their love affair in a fashion most atypical of Byzantine romance, without benefit of clergy. Belthandros is captured by guards as he leaves and they resort to a device whereby he is ostensibly married to Phaidrokaza, Chrysantza's maid, but in fact secretly visits her mistress. Belthandros' status is here clearly defined: as a liege (λίγιος) of Chrysantza's father, the king thinks him a suitable match for his daughter's servant. After this anticipation of their marriage, the two lovers clearly maintain emotional fidelity towards each other, and when Phaidrokaza is persuaded to marry Belthandros her mistress warns her that the marriage is only one of convenience. To support the deception the mistress gives the maid the shift she was wearing in the garden. This episode is uncharacteristic of Byzantine romance as is the surreptitious conduct of a love affair for ten months by stealth, which is far more akin to the Western European romance tradition; when lovers face parental opposition or disapproval in both Byzantine learned romance and *Digenes Akrites*, they immediately elope, not, however, initiating a sexual relationship before they are married with parental consent.¹⁶² The fact that, after their elopement and sufferings, the couple are married to the delight of Belthandros' previously hostile father, King Rodophilos, does not make this romance entirely typical of Greek romance, its sexual mores, in particular the long-term deception in which the lovers indulge, strongly suggesting

162. BC 861-8, 893-923, 982-5, 1041-6. The exchange of shifts is not a motif of Byzantine romance, but for the possible eastern provenance of a similar theme, (which resembles the plot of the very popular late twelfth and early thirteenth century romance *Tristan and Iseult* in which Iseult persuades her maid to take her place with King Mark on their wedding night and they then exchange shifts) see A.H. Krappe, 'La fille de l'homme riche', *B* 17 (1944-5) 339-46. But see Elizabeth M. Jeffreys, *The Question of Western Influence on the Greek Popular Verse Romances with Particular Reference to the Garden-Castle Theme* (unpubl. B.Litt. thesis; Oxford 1968) 242, who states that this episode in Belthandros and Chrysantza follows the Greek literary tradition rather than the French. For the Courtly Love concept of secrecy and of love for a lady of superior station, generally married, see Roger Boase, *The Origin and Meaning of Courtly Love* (Manchester 1977) 89-93, 107-9.

Western European provenance.¹⁶³ *Belthandros and Chrysantza*, too, like *Phlorios*, is perfunctory in its handling and description of the love affair and its progress. When the protagonists meet for the first time in real life, having previously been aware of each other in the dream sequence in the Erotokastron in which Belthandros gave Chrysantza first prize in the beauty contest of forty princesses, which he judged at the request of Eros, they make their mutual recognition known by secret signals. Over two years later, a period of which the romancer is totally silent, he overhears her monologue of her lovesickness and leaps out of the window to join her in her private garden: they faint, half-dead for some considerable time, recover, recollect themselves, exchange a few significant words recalling the beauty contest, Belthandros calling himself Chrysantza's faithful servant ('Ὁς ἰδικὸς σου, δέσποινα, δοῦλος πιστὸς γυρεῦω,/ τ' αὐθεντικά μου πράγματα, κυρία, νὰ φυλάττω'), embrace, kiss, sleep together and finally separate at dawn, an episode explicitly, if laconically, narrated, bearing in mind that for twenty six months they had done nothing but secretly twiddle their fingers at each other.¹⁶⁴ Their ensuing intrigue over the next ten months, in which Belthandros pretends

163. *BC* 1328-35. For adulterous love as a frequent feature of Western European romance, see, for example, *Le roman de Tristan par Thomas*, ed. J. Bédier, 2 vols. (Paris 1902-5) (for Tristan and Iseult), 'an illicit love lived right through to its final and bitter consequences' (John Fox, *A Literary History of France. The Middle Ages* (London 1974) 144); and (for Lancelot and Guinevere) Chrétien de Troie, *Le chevalier de la charrette*, ed. Mario Roques (Paris 1958) ll.3685-4754. The episode however, where Belthandros in the Castle of Love is asked to decide a beauty contest of forty princesses, is certainly a Byzantine motif and one derived from the Byzantine 'bride-show' concept, by which imperial brides were said to have been chosen between 788 and 882, a popular literary motif, whatever the strict historical accuracy of the institution; see Warren T. Treadgold, 'The Bride-shows of the Byzantine Emperors', *B* 49 (1979) 395-413; Lennart Rydén, 'The Bride-shows at the Byzantine Court-History or Fiction?', *Eranos* 83 (1985) 175-91; their relevance to *BC* is discussed by Hunger, *Die Schönheitschönkurrenz*, 150-8; Carolina Cupane, 'Il "concorso de bellezza" in Belthandro e Crisanza sulla via fra Bisanzio e l'Occidente medievale', *JdB* 33 (1983) 221-48.

164. *BC* 824f., 826-68, 861-8, 'Ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἐστράφηκε γελῶντα πρὸς ἐκείνην/ αὐτὸς περιλαμβάνει τὴν καὶ ἔπεσον οἱ δύο/ καὶ ἅπ' τὰ συχνοφιλήματα καὶ ἅπ' τὰς περιπλοκάς των/ τὰ δένδρη τὰ ἀναίσθητα καὶ αὐτὰ ἀντιδonoῦσα./ Ἀναίσθητοι ἐκείοντο μέχρι μεσονυκτίου./ Ἀφοῦ δὲ ἐξεπλήρωσαν τὸ ἤθελαν οἱ δύο/ κ' ἐγνώρισαν τὰ τῆς αὐγῆς τὰ βλέφαρα χαράζουσιν,/ ἡδέως κατεφίλησαν, χωρίζον-ται ἀλλήλως.'

to be married to Phaidrokaza, an affair paralleled only by that of Helen and Paris in the *Troas*, is hardly described, and only when the lovers, having eloped, are separated and Chrysantza is pictured naked and alone on a river bank is the scene pathetic and slightly erotic. Belthandros, himself in a similar plight, finds her and they collapse together. Later, after they have been found, he dresses her in suitably regal robes with his own hands, but apart from the garden scene there are no episodes of demonstrative love between the couple in this work.¹⁶⁵

The Girl of the *Achilleid* is again less typical of the mores of Byzantine romance, though her self-effacing and compliant character and her luxurious and carefully secluded setting, presumably accessible only to such a one as Achilles, are reminiscent of the seclusion in which the heroines of *Digenes Akrites* are brought up. When Achilles, having fallen in love with her after one glimpse of her on the battlements of her father's castle, and having previously aroused the wrath of Eros by his lack of homage, leaps into the princess' garden on this their second meeting, 'Eros' is said to impel them to forestall their marriage there before their elopement, though on the previous occasion they had refrained from so doing. Their marriage is however a proper, if unceremonious affair, and the Girl's behaviour is suitably modest and shamefaced when she later meets her father.¹⁶⁶ Both the *Achilleid*, and *Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe*, emphasize more strongly than the other works the physical attraction inherent in romantic relationships, and while the *Achilleid* repeats the normal clichés of physical passion, the tale of *Kallimachos* employs more subtle imagery. When Achilles first leaps into the Girl's garden like a 'lion', they embrace and kiss, Achilles reviving with his kisses the Girl, who has fainted with shock amongst her flowers at the noise of his arrival in full ar-

165. *BC* 1114f., 1204-8, 1299f. All the description is reserved for the central episode of the Erotokastron, 244-740, where Chrysantza is described at length, 677-720.

166. *Ach.* N706-94, N1071-4, N1233-5; Littlewood, *Romantic Paradises*, 113f.; for the consummation of their affair before marriage, see *Ach.* N1248-51, L933-7; N1080-4; L775-80, and for this behaviour, atypical of Byzantine romance, cf. *PP* 1664-7; *BC* 861-8; for their marriage see *Ach.* N1349-56, N1361-3, N1443-50, N1510-3, N1435-40.

mour, and they lie all night on the Girl's golden and bejewelled couch, kissing and embracing, but, at the Girl's instigation, not consummating the relationship.¹⁶⁷ On the following day, they act similarly before they elope, embracing and kissing and obeying the promptings of Eros, with the Girl clinging tightly to Achilles at the intimation that they should be going.¹⁶⁸ The very presence of the couch in the Girl's exotic garden implies an erotic purpose, the garden itself, with all its wonders, including the golden plane tree, which amaze Achilles on this occasion, being a suitable setting for the commencement of a love affair.¹⁶⁹ Achilles and his Girl, throughout the romance, lose no opportunity to embrace or kiss, and they think nothing of food or sleep, only of love.¹⁷⁰ It is significant that they retire to bed after the Girl's love-song, sung publicly to Achilles, who is 'rooted in her heart'.¹⁷¹ Achilles is happy in both love and prowess until his beloved's sad death after six years of marriage; she begs him to save her from death and, as this is not possible asks for his embrace, this death-bed scene being poignant in its consciousness of deep affection and foreign to the other verse romances in the untimely death of one of the protagonists.¹⁷²

In contrast to the other romances, the hero and heroine of *Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe*, the most Byzantine of the vernacular works, who are perhaps the most liberated because the least socially related of the couples in their fantastic and magical

167. *Ach.* N1073-92; 1081-8, '... περιλαμβάνει τὴν γλυκεῖα, συχνοκαταφιλεῖ τὴν,/ καὶ ἡ κόρη τὸν νεώτερον ἐπεριπλάκηκέν τον,/ πλὴν οὐκ ἔθελήσεν ποσῶς τὸν ἔρωταν πληρῶσαι,/ ἵνα μὴ πάλιν γένηται θερμότερος ὁ πόθος./ οἱ δὲ πρὸς κλίνην ἔπεσαν ἀμφοτέροι καὶ δύο,/ καὶ ἐκ τὰ πολλὰ φιλήματα καὶ τὰς περιπλοκάς τους,/ τὰ δένδρη τὰ ἀναίσθητα καὶ αὐτὰ ἀντιδοноοῦσιν./ καὶ εὐθὺς κατέλαβε ἡ αὐγὴ. . .'.
168. *Ach.* N1247-51, 'μετὰ δὲ τὰ φιλήματα καὶ τὰς περιπλοκάς των/ Ἐρως τοὺς ἐκατέτρωσε νὰ ποιήσῃ θέλημάν του./ καὶ ὁλόγυμνην τὴν ἐκδυσεν μετὰ λινοῦ καὶ μόνου/ τὸ δὲ λινὸν εἰς τὸ ἐκ παντὸς ἦτον ὡς ἄχνη μόνον./ καὶ μετὰ πόθου τοῦ πολλοῦ ἐπλήρωσαν τὸν ἔρων.' N1191f. he kisses the garland she throws him.

169. *Ach.* N768-73, N1085, N1242. For the garden as a scene for erotic action in romance, see Littlewood, *Romantic Paradises*, 97f.; *BC* 832-68; *KC* 2075-120.
170. *Ach.* N1365-7, N1388-402, N1412f., N1532-5.
171. *Ach.* N1536-48; for which compare *Digenes Akrites*, *AND* 1964. For love songs see *Ach.* N970-84, 1223-9, and 1290-4, where he sings of his triumphant elopement to warn the girl's family; cf. *Digenes Akrites*, *GRO* IV, 256-8, 396-406, 427-35; VI, 100-8; ns. 64, 119 above.

172. *Ach.* N1554f., N1602-9, N1617-36.

world, do not marry properly with full parental consent because of the isolated position in which they are circumstanced in the Drakontokastron. But Chrysorrhoe's initially spirited rejections of Kallimachos' advances sufficiently prove her purity and modesty, and though tortured by the ogre who had destroyed her entire country for her sake, she stubbornly refuses to marry him, for marriage appears to be his intention, despite his importunities and the catastrophic cost to her family and country. She emphasizes to Kallimachos that, despite the ogre's cruelty, she has retained her virginity, and despite her rescue at his hands continues to reject Kallimachos, and remains initially unresponsive to both kisses and embraces.¹⁷³ After an unspecified length of time, however, it is implied that she gradually falls in love with him, and they bind themselves by the most frightful oaths to Eros to mutual fidelity and commitment, this representing their marriage.¹⁷⁴ When she is seen kissing Kallimachos on the battlements and later abducted by the rival king with the help of the old witch, Chrysorrhoe's behaviour to her new partner appears just as unresponsive as it had previously been to Kallimachos when he initially fell in love with her, but, on noticing the improvement in her spirits as a result of the reunion with her lover, Kallimachos having entered the king's service as an undergardener, her eunuchs write to the absent king of this pleasant and long-awaited change of heart and suggest that he returns to enjoy it; when the palace staff discover the couple's liaison in the summer-house in her garden, they naturally assume that the queen's intrigue with a gardener is adulterous, and consider it a most heinous crime, treacherous, unnatural and shameful. The king's reaction to the report is deeply emotional; he cannot believe that such a golden girl could be an adulteress, and commands that she is still to be treated with respect and honour.¹⁷⁵ All is vindicated at the trial, where the king agrees that Kallimachos

173. *KC* 587-91, 610f., 614-6, 648-87, 690-3, 703-6, 716f., 730-753.

174. *KC* 759-65. At the trial Chrysorrhoe introduces him to the rival king: 'ἐτοῦτος ἔναι ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ ῥύστης τῶν κακῶν μου, / ὁ φονευτὴς τοῦ δράκοντος, αὐθέντης ἰδικός μου' (*ibid.*, 2481f.).

175. *KC* 2132-6, 2210-2, 2216f., 2221, 2241-8, 2257, 2269-72, 2277-9, 2293f., 2306-11, 2333-5.

has first right to the girl, and that under such circumstances their liaison was not adulterous. Clearly, however, this work has a very Byzantine respect for chastity, and adultery is considered by the secondary characters to be both sinful and shameful,¹⁷⁶ and Chrysorrhoe herself insists on maintaining the highest standards of sexual morality, there being no sympathy in this work whatsoever for the intrigues of courtly love.

Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe is also the vernacular romance most conscious of emotional subtleties and awareness of sexuality. When the heroine is presented, her nakedness, the gothic horror of her situation, as she hangs by her hair, and her incredible beauty combine to heighten her attraction, and Kallimachos is obviously very aware of her charms, both when he first sees her and particularly after the ogre is slain.¹⁷⁷ His amorous attitude towards her causes the girl to break into lamentation at her wretchedness, and she refers again and again, even after the ogre's demise, to her unfortunate and uncomfortable position. Kallimachos, before any other priorities, demands the task of personally doctoring her injuries, and from his observation of her person he deduces her noble descent and asks for her life history, whereupon Chrysorrhoe draws attention to her nakedness and refuses to comply with his request before he has found her some garments and removed the remains of the ogre. Once dressed she continues to lament, and Kallimachos' embraces and his kissing of her wounds and attempts to make her delight in their situation move her to call him cruel and unfeeling.¹⁷⁸ But such talk gradually leads to other topics, and eventually from propinquity their affection grows into mutual passion; indeed, this is the only Byzantine romance in which the love between hero and heroine is seen developing gradually, and as something more than an instantaneous, immutable reaction to the sight of the beloved. With the growth of love, the girl becomes even more radiant in her beauty, and after solemn oaths to Eros, they enter the luxurious

176. *KC* 2221,2270,2293 (πόρνη); 2243,2246 (πορνικόν); *ibid.*, 2270-2 the fact that the affair is with a hired gardener not a noble makes it much worse in the eunuchs' eyes.

177. *KC* 450-69; 583f., 'ἐρρύσατο τῆς φυλακῆς καὶ τῶν πικρῶν ἐκείνων/ σῶμα καλόν, ἐνῆδονον, πανεύμορφον ὥραϊον.'

178. *KC* 586-91,606,609,610f.,612f.,621-6,628-43,729-53.

bathroom, where the beauty of the girl's body and the delights both of the bath, where he finally is allowed to bathe her bruises, and of the splendid bed there,¹⁷⁹ are stressed by understatement, no narrator being able to describe fully the pleasures of that bath or the delights they experienced in the adjoining bed.¹⁸⁰ Now the couple become truly 'kings of the golden castle', living entirely for pleasure in the midst of the most exotic luxury, and such 'privatisation' of lovers, living in a marvellous and secluded paradise of their own completely distanced from all social commitment and responsibility, is a favourite theme of romance.¹⁸¹ The lovers are seen indulging in such joys when the rival king, fortuitously passing with his army, notices them on the castle walls kissing amorously, and, before the lovers are reunited, Kallimachos recalls frequently the delights of the bath, his treatment of Chrysorrhoe's bruises and her beauty; the girl too remembers the episode in the bath during which she gave him a ring, used later as a recognition device.¹⁸² After Kallimachos has finally found Chrysorrhoe after her abduction by his rival, and the two have recognised each other, there is the anticipation and the delights of the resumption of the pleasures of love in their assignations in the summer-house away from the eyes of the girl's prying attendants, and their parting at dawn brings lovers' lamentation.¹⁸³ The erotic quality of the confrontations between the protagonists is enhanced by the inequality in their supposed ranks, queen and gardener, and analogy is constantly drawn between

179. *KC* 754-806. The wonders of the bathroom with its flowers, windows, marble, mirrors, steam, dome, splendid decorations such as a tree of gold and jewels, its rose-water and curious doors and furnace have been described 292-354. Cf. *Digenes Akrites*, *AND* 4232 and *Ach.* N776f. By the Middle Byzantine period the custom of luxurious bathing was only maintained in the palace, and this detailed description emphasizes the uniqueness of this setting; for public baths in Byzantium and their decline, see Mango, *Daily Life*, 337-353.

180. *KC* 803f., 'καὶ τὰς ἐκεῖθεν ἡδονὰς τὰς οὐσας ἐν τῷ στρώμα/ τίς ἐπιη, τίς ἐξηγηθῇ καὶ τίς λέπτολογήσει;'

181. *KC* 805f., 'Ἦσαν λοιπὸν οἱ βασιλεῖς τοῦ χρυσοκάστρου τούτου/ ζῶντες μεθ' ὅσας ἡδονῆς, μετὰ χαρίτων τόσων'. Once they are united, their aim is to return to their magic castle for ever, *ibid.*, 2108-13. Compare the aims of *Digenes* and his love of solitude, above n. 117.

182. *KC* 921-9, 1175f., 1450-3, 1659-64, 1719-24, 1772-7.

183. *KC* 1932-5, 1949-59, 1978-84 (dawn is like darkness to them).

Chrysorrhoe and her garden, both of which Kallimachos tends. Chrysorrhoe significantly uses the images of the 'gardener' in her speech for the defence to the rival king.¹⁸⁴ They embrace, kiss and sleep together and the maidservant who discovers them reports to the palace eunuchs: 'καὶ ταύτην εἶδον μετ' αὐτοῦ συμπαίζουσαν/ φιλοῦσαν καὶ κοιμωμένην. . .'.¹⁸⁵ Their aim in life is merely to be able to enjoy such pleasures freely and privately, and on their release they hasten with joy and gladness back to the magical castle to enjoy in isolation the pleasures of each other's company, fantasy king and queen in a wonderful setting.¹⁸⁶ *Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe* expresses with subtlety and clarity the delights of the relationship between the hero and heroine, in a manner reminiscent of the preoccupations of the twelfth century romancers, though in learned romance erotic descriptions are merely anticipatory, and with exceptional skill in understatement and the avoidance of over-elaboration. The emotion portrayed between the protagonists is, however, though constant and true, one arising purely from physical attractions, while the relationship is described more analytically and realistically than in the other popular verse romances, and the discreet eroticism expressed in this work is unique and similar only to the tone and sophisticated treatment of the work of Makrembolites. Indeed, *Kallimachos*, in its maintenance of moral standards, combined with explicit but tasteful eroticism, has much in common

184. *KC* 1985-95, 2067-87, 2094-7 (the sometime hired man enters the queen's bower 'ὡς βασιλεὺς') 2155-69, 2457-68; for the king's reply, see *ibid.*, 2470-3. Littlewood, *Romantic Paradises*, 113, 'in no other romance is there so sustained and so manifestly sexual imagery drawn from a garden.' Compare the symbolism of the garden in *Le roman de la rose*, ll.1ff., 1614ff., ed. R. Lecoy, I (Paris, 1965).

185. *KC* 2216f.; see also 2096f., 2156-9. *Ibid.*, 1954, Chrysorrhoe on seeing Kallimachos at their first assignation trembles with desire ('ἐντρομος ἐκείνη μετὰ πόθου').

186. *KC* 2110-2, 'καὶ τὰς τοσαύτας χάριτας μὴ κλέπτοντες τρυγῶμεν,/ ἄλλ' ὥς αὐθέντες βασιλεῖς, μετ' ἐλευθέρου τρόπου,/ χωρὶς ὁδύνης ζήσωμεν τὸν ἐφεξῆς μας χρόνον'; 2598-605. In Western European romance love should not lead to unmanliness. The popular verse romances are more akin to the early thirteenth century romance *Aucassin et Nicolette* (ed. Mario Roques, Paris 2nd. ed. 1936) which is a 'comic' tale, deliberately breaking many of the conventions of medieval romance, and in which the heroine is heroic, while the 'hero' does nothing but sigh, leaving all the action to his beloved.

with the romances of the twelfth century and betrays clear signs of its courtly and literary origins, paralleled to some extent only by the rhetorical and structurally sophisticated *Libistros*.

Within Byzantine romance, therefore, it is clear that of the three separate genres, the erudite romances of the twelfth century, the romantic tale of the Arabo-Byzantine border country *Digenes Akrites*, and the Frankish-influenced popular verse romances, all approach the question of sexual morality and conventions of behaviour suited for heroes and heroines in different ways and judge their conduct by different standards. The learned romances can envisage nothing but total chastity on the part of both hero and heroine until their marriage with full parental consent at the end of the tale. *Digenes Akrites*, while the Grottaferrata manuscript shows obvious signs of bowdlerism under the hands of a romancer who objected to the freer and more liberated morality of this work, portrays a world in which, for heroes at least, the occasional extra-marital affair or abduction of a young and beautiful girl — even rape — is not only acceptable but an intrinsic part of the aristocratic lifestyle. For women, however, the opposite is true, and the heroines of *Digenes* are far more secluded, protected and passive than the female protagonists of the Byzantine novel, and chastity remains the most valuable part of a girl's reputation. Of the popular verse romances, in *Libistros and Rhodamne* the protagonists maintain their sexual purity before marriage: the same is true of *Imberios and Margarona*, but the plot shows distinct signs of adaptation at the hands of one who disapproved of the original story-line, in which the couple eloped unmarried, and who made deliberate changes to counteract this tale of misconduct, effectively making nonsense of the tale as it stands. Of the other four romances, in *Phlorios and Platziaphlora*, following the plot of its Western European model, *Belthandros and Chrysantza*, and the *Achilleid* the couple in each case sleep together, surreptitiously before marriage, on one occasion only in the case of the *Achilleid* and *Phlorios* but regularly over a ten month period in *Belthandros*, while in *Kallimachos and Chysorrhoe* the lovers are not actually married with parental consent, but do swear frightful oaths to Eros in place of an actual ceremony before the commencement of their relationship.

the isolation of their magic castle making a more conventional contract impossible: while in both *Belthandros* and the *Achilleid* the lovers' passion has been instigated by Eros, no formal union actually takes place.¹⁸⁷ However, all the couples are faithful to each other and totally committed to a permanent relationship,¹⁸⁸ only the relationship between Libistros' companion Klitovos and Myrtane, in her first husband's lifetime, being somewhat suspicious, and not only is there is no hint of promiscuity, but heroes as well as heroines are shown, like Belthandros,¹⁸⁹ as inexperienced in love. All characters in these fourteenth century works — not that there are many secondary figures in these tales — even rivals in love, such as Berderichos, the Egyptian monarch who abducted Rhodamne, and Chrysorrhoe's royal kidnapper, expect a sexual liaison necessarily to end in marriage, or have marriage as their goal, as in the learned romances and *Digenes*, where even the Amazon Maximo proposes marriage to the hero. In contrast both to the learned romances, where parental consent is totally *de rigueur* and completely essential for the validification of the lovers' happiness, and no passion, however strong, is able to overcome the first duty of the young people, obedience to their parents, despite the fact that in their elopements they have explicitly flouted their parents' wishes, and to *Digenes*, where, except in so far as Eudokia elopes without her father's approval, full honour and respect is paid to parents under all circumstances, the verse romances are much less concerned with social and filial constraints,¹⁹⁰ and the protagonists have much more freedom of

187. Beaton's statement (*The Greek Novel*, 141), 'The rule of chastity, devoutly enforced in most of the ancient and all of the twelfth-century romances, is now explicitly flouted, but the consummation of love at approximately the half-way point of the narrative is followed by a setback', is applicable to some, but not all, of the verse romances.

188. Indeed, the figure of Eros demands total obedience and his commands are unalterable: *LR* N540-65, E663-90; *BC* 369-400, 734-9. Cf. *Ach.* N846-58, 1016-32; *LR* N406-15, E338-49, N317-27, E440-52, E1325-32, S202-9; *KC* 694-9, 761-5, 1452. See Cupane, *Ἔρως βασιλεὺς*, 243-97, esp. 282-97. Klitovos, however, is in love with a married woman and himself marries twice, and cf. *Ach.* N1782-8, where Achilles agrees to marry Paris' sister (Polyxena).

189. *BC* 260-6, he hesitates to enter the Erotokastron over the gate of which is inscribed a threat to all who have not yet experienced the power of Eros.

190. Childlessness is, however, a great misfortune, even in an ideal marriage; *IM* 40-50;

action and liberty to choose their own careers, including their own partners; even the heroines, except for the girl of the *Achilleid*, and she indeed is hardly secluded, in that she has the opportunity to sleep with Achilles before their elopement, enjoy far more sexual and social liberty than their predecessors, and Chrysantza, Margarona, Rhodamne and Platziaphlora are able quite openly to select their future husbands. Achilles' girl has less contact with the opposite sex, but she has the choice of rejecting Achilles' advances should she choose, as can Chrysorrhoe in *Kallimachos* and Eudokia in *Digenes*. Apart from the translated *Phlorios and Platziaphlora*, and the original, though not the Greek, version of *Imberios and Margarona*, all the Byzantine popular works, including *Digenes*, continue their story after the lovers' marriage or their illicit union, such as that of *Belthandros and Chrysantza*. *Digenes'* Girl, Eudokia, like her mother-in-law Irene, is obviously too secluded to have any possible adventures before marriage, but the further career and life-style of the heroines of the verse romances, unlike that their learned predecessors, is obviously still of interest to the public. The more explicit sexual activity and pre-marital relationships described in the verse romances, as opposed to the learned works, seems to be in inverse relation to the occurrence of erotic innuendo and description, and it is in the morally irreproachable and erudite romances that is found the most explicit language and expression, describing in wish-fulfilment or anticipation joys which, by definition, have not yet happened, while in the vernacular works, in which pre-marital sex is frankly and sometimes explicitly described, the narration of erotic incidents and elaboration of prurient innuendo is generally limited to bald accounts of the protagonists' sexual activities, the exception being the most Byzantine of the works, *Kallimachos*. Whereas, in the learned romances, the reader's interest is held by the artificial manoeuvrings of a plot revolving around the threatened chastity not merely of the heroine, à la *Clarissa Harlowe* or *Pamela Andrews*, but of the hero also, in the narration of which the lack of realism is apparent to fellow characters in the works themselves as well as to the modern reader, for the protagonists' much proclaimed innocence is generally heard with incredulity, in *Digenes* and the

other popular works, in contrast, the fantasy or fairy-tale atmosphere, in which the characters live and travel, masks a milieu where they can be shown as behaving with far greater freedom, untrammelled by the rigid constraints of sophistication of plot and social convention. There seems, in reality, to be little differentiation in the sexual morality of the various verse romances, except in the literary and rhetorical *Libistros*, where the relationship between Klitovos and Myrtane has, however, like that of Belthandros and Chrysantza, a hint of courtly love about it, and the Byzantine and sophisticated *Kallimachos*. In the others, despite the fact that prototypes have been discovered for *Imberios* and *Phlorios*, these two works are not more markedly Western European in their conventions of morality and behaviour, and it should be assumed that the plot and characterisation of possibly the *Achilleid*, and certainly *Belthandros*, even possibly the handling of the material in the *Troas*, have been influenced by contact with Frankish literature, thus accounting for the sexual liberation allowed their heroes and heroines.

The Byzantine public, then, had access to three different genres of romance from the twelfth century, which shows the extent to which the romance theme was to the general taste.¹⁹¹ Of these, the learned romances combine an exalted view of chastity, maintained unrealistically in the face of all temptations and threats, which it is, however, often difficult to take seriously, and the details of the preservation of the protagonists' virtue in the teeth of abductors, rapists and the lovers themselves gives the romancer the opportunity to indulge in most explicit erotic descriptions and

Ach. N35-41; *Digenes*, *GRO* VII, 179-82, a note of realism perhaps here intruding into the fantasy world.

191. Beaton, *The Greek Novel*, 136, 'The three twelfth-century romances which survive complete are all of around one hundred and fifty printed pages in length, and were copied many times in manuscript form up until the early seventeenth century, a substantial investment in labour and time that presupposes a larger and more committed readership than is often assumed for them. And the later vernacular romances with their affinities to popular oral poetry and the evidence of free adaptation by successive copyists, seem to have been directed to a wide and approving public. It is at least worth while to ask why these works were written, and what their first readers and auditors expected from them, rather than merely to dismiss them with a perfunctory application of today's aesthetic standards or yesterday's linguistic dogma'.

displays of romantic hyperbole ornamenting a picture of morality triumphant. The fantasies of the aristocracy, and their interest in sex and sensuality, in which men, but not of course women, might indulge in an occasional extra-marital affair, are clearly displayed in the luxurious and exotic lifestyle, atypical of learned romance, enjoyed by both Digenes and Kallimachos and their ladies; while the more general and uneducated fourteenth century public, who wanted tales of love and adventure on the Frankish model, without too much accompanying description, preferred tales of more liberated lovers and their activities before and after marriage despite the fact that these were counter to the behavioural conventions of their society and the preservation of middle-class morality, though it is true that only the *Troas* and possible Klitovos and Myrtane in *Libistros and Rhodamne* touch on adulterous themes, while the tone of Belthandros merely hints at the love of a courtier for a superior lady. Indeed, to that extent, the popular romances retain a regard, if not for chastity, at least for emotional fidelity, which remains an important and essential element in romance themes and which, together with erotic description, or amorousness, provides a recipe for general success. Certainly, despite the greater laxity of sexual mores in the verse romances, they are very far from applauding the themes and concepts of courtly love or relationships which might imply adulterous connotations. In different degrees, popular romance, from both the East and West of the Empire, concentrates on presenting and idealising a sensuous and socially uncommitted lifestyle, with sexual mores at marked variance in many respects from those of learned romance, the popularity of whose themes and motifs is self-evident from the extent to which these tales dominated the popular literature of the late Byzantine Empire.

*Division of Modern Greek,
University of New England, Armidale*

Dancing With Deconstructionists in the Gardens of the Muses: New Literary History vs ?

MARGARET MULLETT

In 1981 I noted that Byzantine literature has never had a good press, least of all from its own students.¹ It was not hard to document this assertion. The opinion of Gibbon that

not a single composition of history, philosophy or literature has been saved from oblivion by the intrinsic beauties of style or sentiment, of original fancy, or even of successful imitation. Their prose is soaring to the vicious affectation of poetry, their poetry is sinking below the flatness and insipidity of prose²

might perhaps be expected, but it found support in the views of Romilly Jenkins:

The Byzantine empire remains almost the unique example of a highly civilized state, lasting for more than a millennium, which produced hardly any educated writing which can be read with pleasure for its literary merit alone.³

Far from opposing this view Cyril Mango in the more recent of his inaugural lectures took this judgement for granted — ‘I do not wish to dispute this harsh verdict’ — and turned his attention instead to the difficulties and dangers for the historian of using Byzantine ‘highbrow’ literature.⁴

It is perhaps time to review the position. My original observation referred both to the curiously pejorative view of the literature expressed by holders of chairs in Byzantine language and literature, and to the low level — or non-existence — of literary

1. M.E. Mullett, *Theophylact Through his Letters: the Two Worlds of an Exile Bishop* (Diss., Birmingham 1981) 1.

2. E. Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 53, ed. J.B. Bury, 3rd ed. (London 1907) VI, 107-8.

3. R.J.H. Jenkins, *Dionysius Solomos* (Cambridge 1940) 57.

4. C. Mango, *Byzantine Literature as a Distorting Mirror* (Inaugural Lecture, University of Oxford 1975) 4.

criticism applied to Byzantine texts. In what ways has the picture changed over the last ten years? A recent survey⁵ takes an optimistic view of the period 1975-1982. The word 'appreciation' in her title alerts us to Hanawalt's priorities and indeed to those of many American scholars in recent years. As early as the Bucharest congress of 1971 A.R. Littlewood⁶ was concerned to combat the strictures of George Dennis on the letters of Manuel II. Dennis was later to write:

Manuel's letters are primarily of a rhetorical nature. . . as such they reflect the worst characteristics of the rhetoric employed by the Byzantines. There is a fundamental dishonesty; while living in one world they speak from another. It is unimportant whether or not what they say is related to reality; how they say it is what matters,⁷

but Father Dennis himself underwent a conversion to a 'positive' view of Byzantine literature, referring to the passage above as 'my unkind words'.⁸ Of course some exceptions had always been made, as Mango noted when he referred to the 'frisson of mystical delight' that some experience while reading the works of Romanos the Melode.⁹ Eva Topping is clearly one of these:

From the fourth to the fifteenth century, for a thousand years, the poet priest voiced the ideals and aspirations of Byzantium. While secular poets busied themselves with imitating ancient models only to produce correct but dry verses, the poets of the church wrote vital, original and significant poetry.¹⁰

Recent work has in fact tended to play down the dependence of the Byzantines on classical models¹¹ or at least illuminate the

5. E. Albu Hanawalt, 'Dancing with Rhetoricians in the Gardens of the Muses: Notes on Recent Study and Appreciation of Byzantine Literature', *Byzantine Studies — Études Byzantines* 13 (1986) 1-23.

6. See the fruits in print, e.g. 'An Ikön of the Soul: the Byzantine Letter', *Visible Language* 10 (1976) 197-226.

7. G.T. Dennis, *The Letters of Manuel II Palaeologus* (Dumbarton Oaks Texts, 4 [CFHB 8] Washington DC 1977) xviii-xx.

8. G.T. Dennis, 'The Byzantines as Revealed in their Letters', *Gonimos: Neoplatonic and Byzantine Studies presented to Leendert G. Westerink at 75 = Arethusa* (Buffalo 1988) 159.

9. Mango, *Distorting Mirror*, 4.

10. E. Topping, 'The Poet-Priest in Byzantium', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 14 (1969).

11. See for example the contributors to M.E. Mullett and R. Scott, *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition* (Birmingham 1981).

creativity of the Byzantines' mimesis,¹² building on the crucial perception of Hunger, that imitation was not thought of as plagiarism but as an indication of literary skill.¹³ There has also been a shift in perceptions of rhetoric. Although Donald Nicol could still describe rhetoric as 'the canker in the cultural blood of the Byzantines',¹⁴ G.L. Kustas, writing at about the same time as Mango's 'Distorting Mirror' had already paved the way for understanding rhetoric as the expression of Byzantine ideology.¹⁵ Also the publication of *Menander Rhetor* highlighted the attempt to arrive at a Byzantine aesthetic, and to enable us to evaluate Byzantines' writings on their own terms.¹⁶

In fact a wind of change has been blowing through the study of Byzantine literature. In particular Cyril Mango's lecture provided a powerful stimulus to scholars who could not accept his disparaging judgements. It became necessary to show that Byzantine literature was sophisticated, complex,¹⁷ a not-too-distorted reflection of Byzantine life,¹⁸ but scholars also began to ask the same questions that they would of any other literature without feeling the need to evaluate or defend. Yet even post-Hellenistic literature needed its defenders in this period, as the editors of a volume of *Yale Classical Studies* explain.¹⁸ But the cause of

12. G. Moravcsik, 'Klassizismus in der byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung', *Polychronion, Festschrift F. Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag* (Heidelberg 1966) 366-377; see also I. Ševčenko, *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos* (CBHB 3, Brussels 1962) 171, n.2; H. Maguire, 'Truth and Convention in Byzantine Descriptions of Works of Art', *DOP* 28 (1974) 131.

13. H. Hunger, 'On the Imitation (μίμησις) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature', *DOP* 23-24 (1969-70) 15-38.

14. D.M. Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire* (London 1979) 47.

15. G.L. Kustas, *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric* (Analekta Vlatadon 13, Thessalonike 1974).

16. D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson, *Menander Rhetor, edited with Translation and Commentary* (Oxford 1981).

17. The best example is the recent work of Margaret Alexiou in the Byzantine field, notably 'A Critical Reappraisal of Eustathios Makrembolites' *Hysmine and Hysminias*, *BMGS* 3 (1977) 23-43; 'Literary Subversion and the Aristocracy in Twelfth-century Byzantium: a Stylistic Analysis of the *Timarion* (ch 6-10)', *BMGS* 8 (1982/3) 29-45; 'The Poverty of Ecriture and the Craft of Writing; towards a Reappraisal of the Prodic Poems', *BMGS* 10 (1986) 1-40.

18. P. Magdalino, 'The Literary Perception of Everyday Life in Byzantium: Some General Considerations and the Case of John Apokaukos', *BS* 47 (1987) 23-38.

19. *Yale Classical Studies*, 27, eds. J.J. Winkler and G. Williams (1982).

Byzantine literature has been taken up in recent years by Alexander Kazhdan. In an article in *JÖB*, in his *People and Power*, in *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* and in *Change in Byzantine Culture* the message is very clear; Byzantine literature is worth reading and we should read it.²⁰

With these developments we have left the era of professional disparagement, of 'the literature we love to hate' attitude. And perhaps in order to reach this position a naive response ('the literature we love to love') was necessary. But it is questionable whether Byzantine literature is best served in the 1990s by such a primitively evaluative approach.

Even if disparagement is no longer universal a problem which may well remain is the invisibility of Byzantine literature. Nigel Wilson wrote:

This book is intended to give an account of what happened to Greek literature from the end of the antique world until the reappearance of classical studies in Western Europe during the Renaissance.²¹

What happened was surely that Greek literature went on being written. Wilson's account was different: his book is not a history of Byzantine literature, but a history of the fortunes of ancient Greek literature in the Middle Ages. Is Byzantine literature invisible in this way only when classicists write about Byzantium, or is Byzantine literature invisible because Byzantine literary studies are invisible? Is there any Byzantine literary criticism and how good is it?

The answer must be that literature is still the Cinderella of Byzantine Studies. At symposia and congresses literature is lucky to

20. A. Kazhdan, 'Der Mensch in der byzantinischen Literaturgeschichte', *JÖB* 28 (1979) 1-21; with G. Constable, *People and Power in Byzantium. An Introduction to Modern Byzantine Studies* (Washington DC 1982); with S. Franklin, *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Cambridge and Paris 1984); with A.W. Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1985). Of these, *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (hereafter *Studies*) is the most important, as a recently reworked set of essays written in the Soviet Union, reminding Western scholars both of the contribution of his Soviet colleagues and of the relative status of literature in their researches compared with the West.

21. N. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London 1983) 1.

be given one section; a whole colloquium on a text is a rarity. Byzantine periodicals rarely contain more than occasional studies of texts though fortunately many are willing to publish new texts. Kazhdan demonstrated in Vienna²² that there is no literary history of Byzantium, despite the triple rewriting of Krumbacher's *Handbuch*. A cursory comparison (taken at random) with the neighbouring disciplines of western medieval studies and of classics shows the poverty of the Byzantine bibliography. There is today no Alastair Minnis or Peter Dronke or Francis Cairns or Woodman & West of Byzantine Studies — but there is no Curtius or Fraenkel either. Anyone teaching a survey course on Byzantine literature knows that each lecture or reading list begins: 'there is no standard work on this author/period/genre/milieu. . . I suggest taking X's study of Y and applying it to Byzantium'.

This may seem an unduly negative picture in view of what has actually been published during the last ten years. Fundamental methodological groundwork had been provided with the publication of Hunger's *Handbuch*, with the *Stilstufen* approach of Hunger and Ševčenko, and with the metrical theories of Hörandner which will deeply influence the editing of texts. New editions this decade include the great Psellos project, Gautier's *Théophylacte*, so long awaited but alas posthumous, philosophical works, saints' lives, military treatises; there is no pause in the work of editing and publishing Byzantine works. Translations also have seen great development in the decade; the Australian series, with the Liverpool series, the Classics of Western Spirituality and St Vladimir's Seminary Press continue to make Byzantium more widely known.

Compared with editions and translations literary studies are much thinner on the ground, and are rarely purely literary. This reflects both the properly interdisciplinary nature of the subject, and the uncertainty over the very basis of Byzantine literature. How literate²³ was Byzantine society and who wrote its literature

22. Kazhdan, *Der Mensch*.

23. For the literacy debate see R. Browning, 'Literacy in the Byzantine World', *BMGS* 4 (1978) 39-54; C. Mango, *Byzantium: the Empire of New Rome* (London 1980) 237 ff.; E. Patlagean, 'Discours écrit, discours parlé: niveaux de culture à Byzance au

and where?²⁴ The Dumbarton Oaks symposium on *Books and Bookmen*²⁵ reverberated throughout the decade; questions of patronage and social localisation²⁶ became as frequent as in art history; literature approached social anthropology in the eighties as religion had in the seventies. Studies on the borders of literature and art opened new possibilities, which were not always fully explored.²⁷ Work on women, private life and the body began to spill over into textual study.²⁸

Certain areas flourished. One is early Byzantine historiography. In English alone studies of Eusebius, Evagrius, Ammianus Marcellinus, the fifth-century fragments, Procopius, Menander Protector and Theophylact Simocatta together with two Australian conferences on historiography and the two splendid volumes of the Malalas project make it a bumper decade. Taken with *Agathias* and work in progress on Sokrates and Theophanes it should now be the best understood area of Byzantine literature.²⁹

VIIIe-XIe siècles', *Annales ESC* 34 (1979) 264-278; N. Oikonomidès, 'Mount Athos; Levels of Literacy', *DOP* 42 (1988) 167-178. See the forthcoming *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. R. McKitterick (Cambridge 1990).

24. On the Byzantine literary class see Kazhdan and Constable, *People and Power*, 101 ff.; H.G. Beck, *Das literarische Schaffen der Byzantiner. Wege zu seinem Verständnis*, Sitzungsberichte der Österr. Akad. d. Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse 294, 4 Abh. (Vienna 1974); M.E. Mullett, 'Aristocracy and Patronage in the Literary Circles of Comnenian Constantinople', *The Byzantine Aristocracy, IX-XIII Centuries*, ed. M.J. Angold (BAR, Int. Ser. 221, Oxford 1984) 173-201.

25. *Byzantine Books and Bookmen. A Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium* (Washington DC 1975).

26. For patronage see for example, E. Jeffreys, 'The Sevastokratorissa Eirene as Literary Patroness: the Monk Iakovos', *JÖB* 32/3 (1982) 63-71. A. Kazhdan, 'The Social Views of Michael Attaleiates', *Studies* 23-86, is a devastatingly efficient example of the technique of social localisation.

27. H. Maguire, *Art and Eloquence in Byzantium* (Princeton 1981); R. Macrides and P. Magdalino, 'The Architecture of Ekphrasis: Construction and Context of Paul the Silentiary's poem on Hagia Sophia', *BMGS* 12 (1989) 47-82; E. James and R. Webb, 'To Understand Ultimate Things and Enter Secret Places; Ekphrasis and Art in Byzantium', forthcoming, breaks new ground.

28. C. Galatariotou, 'Holy Women and Witches: Aspects of Byzantine Conceptions of Gender', *BMGS* 9 (1984/5) 55-94; 'Eros and Thanatos: a Byzantine Hermit's Conception of Sexuality', *BMGS* 13 (1989) 95-137.

29. Of all this effort, the contribution of Australian scholars is perhaps the most impressive, particularly their model collaborative work. See *History and Historians in Late Antiquity*, eds. B. Croke and A. Emmett (Sydney and Oxford 1983); *Reading*

Here editing, translation and study go hand in hand. Few areas can compete. The decade has seen considerable advances on the subject of Digenes Akrites with the publication and discussion of the Escorial text, and contributions from feminism and social anthropology.³⁰ The Byzantine romance saw considerable advances. Innovative work on twelfth-century satire and parody has revealed new problems.³¹ Hagiography has its own impetus, as has hymnography, much slowed down by the sad death of Grosdidier de Matons.³² But what is missing is quite as impressive as what exists.

We lack studies of most genres at most periods. Work is in progress on homilies, the letter, epigrams, parainesis, late byzantine historiography but there is a great deal left to be done. Studies of authors which cross the genre barrier are very rare: A. Cameron, *Procopius and the Sixth Century* (London, 1985) is a distinguished exception. We still have no full-length study of Theodore Prodromos (since Papadimitriu) and we look forward to Kazhdan's *Niketas Choniates*. We lack wide-ranging considerations of Byzantine literature, although work on the genre system and on innovation and originality is in progress. We also lack specialists in literature. It is instructive to note who are the scholars writing on Byzantine literature: few of them write only on

the past in Late Antiquity, eds. G. Clarke, B. Croke, and R. Mortless (Canberra 1990); *The Chronicle of John Malalas. A Translation*, by E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys and R. Scott with B. Croke, J. Ferber, S. Franklin, A. James, D. Kelly, A. Moffatt, A. Nixon (Byzantine Australasia 4, Melbourne 1986); *Studies in John Malalas*, ed. E. Jeffreys with B. Croke and R. Scott (Byzantina Australasia 6, Sydney 1990).
30. E.g. S. Alexiou, *Βασίλειος Διγενῆς Ακρίτης (καί το χειρόγραφο τοῦ Εσκοριάλ) καί το ἄσμα τοῦ Ἀρμυουρη* (Athens 1984); C. Galatariotou, 'Structural Oppositions in the Grottaferrata Digenes Akritas', *BMGS* 11 (1987) 29-68; P. Magdalino, 'Honour amongst Romaioi: the Framework of Social Values in the World of Digenes Akritas and Kekaumenos', *BMGS* 13 (1989) 183-318.

31. E.g. Alexiou, *The Poverty of Ecriture*.

32. Hagiographic studies are still dominated by *Analecta Bollandiana* and *Subsidia Hagiographica*, but see *The Byzantine Saint*, ed. S. Hackel (Birmingham 1981), and for an interdisciplinary approach to a single dossier and cult, see *The Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia*, eds. M.E. Mullett and A.M. Wilson (BBTT, 2, Belfast, forthcoming). There is still room for the purely literary approach to hagiography. For hymns see J. Szövérfy, *A Guide to Byzantine Hymnography. A Classified Bibliography of Texts and Studies* (Brookline, Mass., and Leyden 1978-9).

literature. Apart from the polymaths of the elder generation, most are classicists slumming, neohellenists pushing back the borders of modern Greek or historians newly sensitive to the nature of the sources they use. Much of the most interesting work of this last kind goes back to the impact of Evelyn Patlagean's study of hagiography in the early seventies,³³ when seminar gambit 'isn't that a topos?' began to be answered by 'yes, but why is it used *here*?' Without this involvement of historians we would be without Paul Magdalino on Snobbery or Catia Galatariotou on Travel.³⁴ Yet it is surely curious that so few people would choose to identify themselves as students of Byzantine literature. There is in English a wider problem, that there is no simple parallel to the description 'art historian': 'literary historian'; 'literary critic'; 'literary theorist' are distinct designations, none of which quite adds up to the whole. ('Literary scholar' suggests dilettante scribblings.) But even to reply 'I work on Byzantine literature' to the query 'what do you do?' must be rare enough.

What this survey reveals is the rare example of a European literature which is to all intents and purposes virgin territory for the post-structuralist. There is no Old Literary History for New Literary History to replace.³⁵ For New Criticism read No Criticism. The rare examples of works with some theoretical foundation stand out starkly from their fellows: Patlagean's structuralism and *Annales*-school history as applied to texts;³⁶ Margaret Alexiou's mixture of post-Freudianism and narratology;³⁷ the Jeffreys' rigorous but ultimately unconvincing attempt to apply the Parry-Lord theory of oral composition in

33. E. Patlagean, 'Ancienne hagiographie byzantine et histoire sociale', *Annales ESC* 23 (1968) 106-126.

34. P. Magdalino, 'Byzantine Snobbery', ed. M.J. Angold, *The Byzantine Aristocracy*, 58-78; C. Galatariotou, paper given to the XXIV Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge 1990.

35. H.R. Jauss, 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory', *New Literary History* 2 (1970) 7-37. This periodical was founded with the aim of reviving the then discredited practice of literary history, more soundly grounded in theory, rather than of replacing an older school.

36. E. Patlagean, *Structure sociale, famille, chretienté à Byzance* (London, Variorum 1981).

37. M. Alexiou, *A Critical Reappraisal*.

Byzantine texts.³⁸ These exceptions point to the fact that the study of Byzantine literature has (at least in the West) failed to take advantage of any advances made in other literatures. It is not that there is any great hostility to theory: welcoming voices have sounded from the London Institute of Classical Studies seminar on *Reading Byzantium* in 1988 and from the Australian Byzantine Studies Conference in Sydney 1989.³⁹ It is simply that the work lies ahead of us.

In some ways it is surprising that the timelessness and placelessness of Byzantine literature, so clear to Mango and so despised by Dennis, did not point long ago to a formalist analysis. What better literature for this approach than one where it is easy not to be distracted by referential detail? If 'the author is dead',⁴⁰ how much better to be working with a literature where apparently insoluble problems of authorship and authenticity are rife; it no longer matters whether Theodore Prodromos or Constantine Manasses wrote Theodore Prodromos. A literature accepted by all as comprehensible in terms of rhetoric should have benefited from the revival of interest in rhetoric of all kinds.⁴¹ A literature thought to be so derivative of its classical forebears might have had an anxious Bloomsday.⁴² A literature in which narrative has in practice been privileged by modern readers could have gained more from the stream of Genette-inspired works on

38. E. and M. Jeffreys, *Popular Literature in Late Byzantium* (London, Variorum 1983).

39. Roddy Beaton's paper, 'Reading Byzantine Literature', is unpublished; for Michael Jeffreys' see 'Literary Theory and the Criticism of Byzantine Texts' (abstract), *Byzantine Studies in Australia Newsletter* 24 (1990) 9.

40. R. Barthes, 'The Death of the Author', *Image, Music, Text*, tr. and ed. S. Heath (London and New York 1977) 142-148.

41. See for example at one extreme all three books of Paul de Man, *Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism* (New York and Oxford 1971); *Allegories of Reading: Figural Language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke and Proust* (New Haven 1979); and especially *The Rhetoric of Romanticism* (New York 1984); at another the International Society for the Study of Rhetoric was founded at Zurich in 1977; see B. Vickers, *Rhetoric Revalued* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 19, Binghampton, New York 1982).

42. H. Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: a Theory of Poetry* (New York and London 1973).

narrative.⁴³ Where language questions abound and intersect with levels of style, it is surprising that Saussure and all that flows from him have not been invoked. The one advantage for literary studies of the systematic disparagement of Byzantine literature is that there is no canon based on value judgments; there is a sense of a hierarchy of genres instilled by the *Handbucher* but that is a different problem. Above all Byzantinists never expect reading to be easy: the very difficulty of their texts cries out for hermeneutic practices which take that difficulty into account. The scholar who is accustomed to the riddle-mentality of the twelfth century may find relief as well as enlightenment in Derrida.

But there are reasons why Byzantinists, unlike classicists, were unlikely to seize upon New Criticism and its aftermath even if they had seen their job as untying a text or ever been aware of what their counterparts in other disciplines were doing. Classicists after a slow start took very easily to close reading, to the critical virtues of tension and sincerity, ambiguity and irony, at least in poetic discourse.⁴⁴ Greek drama or Latin love elegy is after all more easily assimilable to the literary criticism of Renaissance and post-Renaissance English, the literature for which this reading practice was evolved. A literature in which poetic discourse may be located in a genre (the letter) which in the Western view of things was at best a minor art, and in which a new metre (the *politikos stichos*) was regarded as the most pedestrian of forms of discourse clearly poses problems for a New Critic, though not for a poststructuralist, with the study of film, strip cartoons, picture postcards subverting evaluative canons. And what would any Byzantinist make of a verbal icon with no prototype?

In a sense this is a pity, although I do not believe that there is any necessity to reinvent the wheel and in every literature

43. G. Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, tr. E. Lewin (Cornell 1980); e.g. ed. W.J.T. Mitchell, *On Narrative* (Chicago 1980-1); F.K. Stanzel, *A Theory of Narrative*, tr. C. Goetsche (Cambridge 1984).

44. On classicists' engagement with New Criticism see M.J. McGann, 'Moral Dimensions and Critical Approaches in Horace', *Gymnasium*, Beiheft 9, eds. H.W. Schmidt and P. Wülfing, *Antikes Denken-Moderne Schule* (Heidelberg 1988) 183-6. New Criticism was already seen as on the way to being passé by C. Segal, 'Ancient Texts and Modern Literary Criticism', *Arethusa* 1 (1968) 1-25.

reproduce the gains of each critical school. But the role of New Criticism to some extent explains the difference between classicists' treatment of Ovid's exile discourse and Byzantinists' treatment of the twelfth-century episcopal epistolographers. Recently Latinists have faced up to the problem of whether Ovid ever went to Tomi;⁴⁵ Byzantinists continue to take as clear evidence of the writer's *attitudes in practice* every complaint and criticism of his (supposed) surroundings.⁴⁶ Classicists also seized very happily upon the concept of *persona* in poetic discourse,⁴⁷ while the Prodromic problem was dogged for years by scholars objecting to solutions because of *what a poet said about himself in a poem*. Only in Byzantine literature were begging poets assumed to be beggars.

But the problem goes deeper, and I suspect that though formalist strategies may help us superficially or temporarily only a historicist reading practice will answer to the expectations of Byzantinists who have for years treated the literature of the empire as a body of historical source material. I hope to explore this problem more fully elsewhere, but there is a problem in that because such a high proportion of the source material of Byzantine history is literary, privileged, historians have regarded it as something demanding historical rather than literary analysis. At the crudest level they charge through with card indexes and databases plundering for historical facts and complaining when the text's complexity or vacuity eludes their rape. At another level analysis is concerned to present an *Urtext* or to strip it of accretions and demonstrate on historian's veracity. This is the Bollan-

45. The outlines of a debate on this subject can be traced in *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 10 (1985) 19-22 (A.D. Fitton-Brown); 48 (A.W.J. Holleman); 12 (1987) 23 (H. Hoffmann). But there is more to be said.

46. For an alternative view see my 'Byzantium and the Slavs: the Views of Theophylact of Ochrid', *Miscellany in Memoriam Ivan Dujcev*, ed. A. Djourova (Sofia, forthcoming).

47. See W.S. Anderson, 'Roman Satires and Literary Criticism', *Bucknell Review* 12 (1964) 106-113 (= *Essays in Roman Satire* [Princeton 1982] 3-10); M.J. McGann, *Studies in Horace's First Book of Epistles* (Coll. Lat. 100, Brussels 1969) 96 and n.1; N. Rudd, 'Theory: Sincerity and Mask', in *Lines of Enquiry* (Cambridge 1976) 145-181. Against the use of *persona*: R.O.A.M. Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets. From Catullus to Horace* (Oxford 1980) viii.

dist approach to sources: all very well except that what these historians throw out is as important as what they leave in. *Quellenforschung* may reconstruct the history of composition, but the history of reception should be just as important, an observation which has important consequences for the editing of medieval texts, a point made long ago by David Holton. Other historians of Byzantium are deeply receptive to theory provided it is not literary. Psychology, social anthropology, marxism, feminism all have their place; but they ignore the fact that what they are using are literary texts and that a double level of theory is necessary. Others acclaim the approximation of literature and history: 'There exists at present, as there has not for some decades, the possibility of serious cooperation between the fields of history and literature'.⁴⁸ For Stock this lies in the popularity of the study of *mentalité* among medievalists as well as in trends in current literary theory. Literary scholars might be forgiven for treating this clarion call with suspicion: once the historians rampaged through plundering for facts; now they rampage through plundering for mentalities.

But there are encouraging signs in the development of theory; the emphasis on reception rather than the author, and thus on 'horizons of expectation';⁴⁹ the separation of a 'then-meaning' from a 'now-meaning',⁵⁰ the New Historicists' call for the demise of formalism and the proclamation of a New Literary History.⁵¹ It is not at all an inauspicious time for enlisting the help of literary theory in some of the trickiest problems currently

48. B. Stock, 'History, Literature, and Medieval Textuality', *Images of Power. Medieval History/Discourse/Literature*, eds. K. Brownlee and S.G. Nichols, in *Yale French Studies* 70 (1986) 7.

49. Jauss, *New Literary History* 2 (1970) 24 ff.

50. This is a distinction of F.W. Bateson used helpfully by A. Fowler, *Kinds of Literature. An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford 1982) 263-276.

51. New Historicism has been most clearly associated with recent work in renaissance English, see E. Pechter, 'The New Historicism and its Discontents', *PMLA* 102 (1987), 292-303, but has affinities with much wider attempts to reconcile Marxism with formalism, or to seek new, historicist, alignments. See for example, E. Said, *The World, the Text, and the Critic* (London 1984); F. Lentricchia, *After the New Criticism* (London 1980); *Poststructuralism and the Problem of History*, eds. D. Attridge, G. Bennington and R. Young (Cambridge 1989). See C. Porter, 'After the New Historicism', *New Literary History* 21 (1990) 253-272, for a critique.

assailing the student of Byzantine literature. The relation between production and reception is one of these, as is the nature of Byzantine literary society; reader-response and Rezeptions theorie must surely be brought to bear here.⁵² The problem of intentionalism has yet to be tackled by a byzantinist although it has raised its head in readings of textual and visual sources,⁵³ it cannot be studied in isolation from other literatures. The problem of context, of the relation between the privileged discourse of our sources and the intertextual or referential reality is one of the major challenges, but so is the question of the nature of Byzantine literature itself. What was privileged text for the Byzantines? The problem of parody throws this into relief. So far attempts to isolate parody have been fraught with controversy. Alexiou's brilliant reading of the 'doux' episode in the *Timarion* has not drawn total belief from habitual readers of panegyric; Macrides' rigorous and cautious offering of the cannibal poem with its negative analysis vis a vis parody has quickly met (unfairly) with an alternative affirmative solution.⁵⁴ If we were more sure about the nature of literary discourse, might we not be more equipped to decide about parody? One definition of literature will certainly not do for Byzantium, even with Todorov's modifier: literature is fiction.⁵⁵

52. For an excellent anthology see S. Suleiman and I. Crosman, *The Reader in the Text. Essays on Audience and Interpretation* (Princeton, 1980). Surveys by R.C. Holub, *Reception Theory. A Critical Introduction* (New York 1984) and E. Freund, *The Return of the Reader. Reader-Response Criticism* cover slightly wider ground than their titles imply. G. Grimm, *Rezeptionsgeschichte* (Munich 1977) taken with R. Warnung, *Rezeptionsaesthetik* (Munich 1979) is useful; classic treatments are H.R. Jauss, *Towards an Aesthetic of Reception*, tr. T. Bahti (Brighton 1982); W. Iser, *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore 1974); U. Eco, *The Role of the Reader. Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts* (London 1981); S. Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge Mass. 1980). For reception theory and classics, see *Arethusa* 19.2 (1986).

53. Many of the most interesting suggestions in R. Cormack, *Writing in Gold* (London, 1985) are intentionalist; generic analysis may necessarily be so. A new study is needed.

54. Alexiou, 'Literary Subversion'; R. Macrides, 'Poetic Justice in the Patriarchate. Murder and Cannibalism in the Provinces', *Cupido Legum*, eds. L. Burgmann, M-Th Fogen, A. Schmink (Frankfurt 1985) 137-168.

55. Fowler, *Kinds of Literature*, 6, citing Benniston Gray and quoting Todorov as arguing that a true story can be viewed as if it were literature.

The arrival of fiction in Byzantine literature has recently been given a date,⁵⁶ though the relation between fiction and other kinds of narrative still remains to be considered. In particular our understanding of the revival of the novel or romance in Byzantium has seen considerable advances over the past decade. Studies of the ancient novel and of the Greek novel have allowed the Byzantine twelfth-century and Palaiologan romances to take a modest place. The subtle reading of *Hysmine and Hysminias* offered by Alexiou, too favourable for Tomas Hägg in 1983, has found support in recent scholarship, notably from Antony Littlewood.⁵⁷ Carolina Cupane has isolated thematic elements; Polyakova established relationships among the romances and with the medieval west,⁵⁸ and Kazhdan has boldly used the romances as indicators of changing ideologies.⁵⁹ It is however with Roderick Beaton's new book, *The Medieval Greek Romance* (Cambridge 1989) that we can see the current state of knowledge of the genre set out, and indeed far more. Besides its merits to specialists on the Byzantine romance or the Greek novel, it is an important landmark in Byzantine literary studies in general.

For one thing it is the first of several studies of groups of texts currently planned or in progress. Second, it is an uncompromisingly literary treatment of incontrovertibly literary texts. Third, although it eschews overtly evaluative terms and expresses the historicist aim of detecting 'the implicit politics of the writers and

56. See *The Greek Novel AD 1-1985*, ed. R. Beaton (London 1988) especially the contributions of Charlotte Roueche and Roddy Beaton.

57. T. Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Oxford 1983) 75: 'Perhaps this time the pendulum has swung a bit too far in the positive direction'; A Littlewood, 'Romantic Paradises: the Role of the Garden in the Byzantine Romance', *BMGS* 5 (1979) 95-114.

58. The appearance of two articles by Carolina Cupane in 1974 was an important turning point; 'Un caso di giudizio di Dio nel romanzo di Teodoro Prodromo', *Rivista di studi Bizantini e Neellenici*, n.s. 10-11 (1974) 147-168; '“Ἔρως-Βασίλειος”': la figura di Eros nel romanzo bizantino d'amore', *Atti del Accademia di Arti di Palermo*, er. 4, 33/2 (1974) 243-297. Of all the recent Soviet scholarship, even including Ljubarskij, that of Polyakova has come closest to influencing work in the West; S. MacAlister, 'Byzantine Twelfth-century romances: a Relative Chronology', *BMGS* 15 (1991) forthcoming, deserves serious consideration.

59. E.g. 'Imberios and Margarona; the Manuscripts, Sources and Edition of a Byzantine Verse Romance', *B* 41 (1971) 122-160; 'The Comnenian Background to the romans d'antiquité', *B* 10 (1980) 455-486. Kazhdan, e.g. *People and Power*, 108 ff.

the first readers' it is a favourable account, something remarkable in studies of the genre.⁶⁰ Fourth, it frees the Byzantine romance from the dead hand of the classics and an unnatural isolation from contemporary story-telling in both east and west — though it is the work of a neohellenist who prefers the term 'medieval Greek' to 'Byzantine', an alternative form of cultural imperialism? And fifth, its author is open to theory.

For the Byzantinist a major advantage of the work is his treatment of all sixteen romances from *Digenes* to *Erotokritos*, the twelfth-century and the later romances together. He first looks at the twelfth-century background, then at the literary background which involves *Digenes Akritas* (a proto-romance?) and the genesis of the revival of the genre and thematic elements before characterising the four surviving examples. He anchors them firmly in a rhetorical poetic before turning to the later group, which he sees in terms of the formation of modern Greek literature and the vernacular experiments. He then considers in turn the 'original romances' and the translations of western romances, from the point of view of story and then narrative. A chapter on the genealogy of the romances deals with the genre's relation with the Hellenistic novel and with western romance; in another on common elements he sagely weighs the theories of Jeffreys, Spadaro and Gemert/Bakker and offers his own intertextual explanation. A final chapter considers the evidence for reception in a straightforward way, while making original use of Meliteniotes as parody. His conclusion (if there can be one in such an essentially descriptive work) is a justification of the book's status as a work of literary history.

There are many excellent things in the book. His perception of twelfth-century innovation as in many ways parallel to developments in Western Europe has been foreshadowed in other

60. B.E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances. A Literary-historical Account of their Origins* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1967) 103: 'the slavish imitators of Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus which were written in the twelfth century by such miserable pedants as Eustathius Macrembolites, Theodorus Prodromus and Nicetas Eugenianus, trying to write romance in what they thought was the ancient manner. Of these no account need be taken'.

works⁶¹ but is crucial to his reading of the revival of the genre in Byzantium. His use of eastern story-telling parallels could perhaps have been expanded with a consideration of the frame-story in Byzantium — hagiographical collections like John Moschos' *Pratum Spirituale* may perhaps qualify. His use of the *progymnasmata* of Nikephoros Basilakes is extremely apposite and challenging to any view of the relationship between 'rhetorical' and 'other' forms of literature. His analysis of the *Ptochoprodromika* is brief but helpful, and he is as always intelligent and surefooted. There are occasional oddities of detail, as when he omits references to Magdalino on sanctity and Oikonomides on Digenes, and historians may well quibble with some of his statements: he draws here and elsewhere⁶² a fascinating picture of the ramifications of Lemerle's 'traumatisme de Manzikert'⁶³ but after Cheynet⁶⁴ not all will accept his simplistic view of the military impact of that battle; his acceptance of the Clucas view⁶⁵ of the trial of John Italos will certainly not attract general support. But these are minor quibbles in an extremely useful volume whose relationship with the colloquium publication on the Greek Novel is helpfully highlighted. His use of theory is eclectic: Jauss to explain the phenomenon of revival; Genette for his major analysis of narrative technique; Baüml on orality; curiously Wellek and Warren in his conclusion. Without the level of theory it might have been a similar book; it would certainly have been a less thoughtful one.

All this augurs well for the future of the study of Byzantine literature. Within a decade we have moved from disparagement

61. R. Beaton, 'Courtly Romances in Byzantium; a Case Study in Reception', *Mediterranean History Review* 4 (1989) 345-355.

62. R. Beaton, 'Cappadocians at Court: Digenes and Timarion', *Alexios I Komnenos, Papers of the Second Belfast Byzantine Colloquium at Portaferry*, eds. M.E. Mullett and D.C. Smythe (Belfast, forthcoming).

63. This idea was endemic to *TM* 6 (1976), and to P. Lemerle, *Cinq études sur le XI^e siècle byzantin* (Paris 1977).

64. J.C. Cheynet, 'Manzikert: un désastre militaire?', *B* 50 (1980) 410-438.

65. L. Clucas, *The Trial of John Italos and the Crisis of Intellectual Values in Byzantium in the Eleventh Century* (Munich 1981); R. Browning, 'Enlightenment and Repression in Byzantium in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', *Past and Present* 69 (1975) 3-23.

to appreciation to criticism to theory. There may soon be a stream of literary studies of literary texts which engage, as in any other European literature, with contemporary literary theory. We may look forward to thoroughgoing Jaussian analyses of X or Derridean readings of Y.⁶⁶ We may also be fortunate to escape both the 'Have they caught the Cambridge Structuralist yet?' attitude of classicists⁶⁷ and the hysterical and highly personal tirades of pro-theory neohellenists.⁶⁸ But one would hope that this would mean variety, debate and opportunity rather than any narrow orthodoxy. Only if this were the prognosis would it be possible to visualise in future a true pendant to John Haldon's article in this journal on history and Robin Cormack's on art history.⁶⁹

In 1986 Ihor Ševčenko made his own prophecy.⁷⁰ 'Everything is circular', he said. 'Art historians will go back to looking at style, literary historians will edit texts and we shall all stop talking about patronage'. Cormack's critical study answers the first statement, but the two which apply to literature perhaps need consideration. One would hope that the editing of texts will continue unabated and that naive views of patronal determinism will be refined,⁷¹ but any assumption that positivism is the only way

66. S. MacAlister, 'Bakhtin's Alien Speech and Twelfth-century Romances', (abstract) *Byzantine Studies in Australia, Newsletter*, 9-10 appears to be a pioneering study.

67. Classicists have taken even more slowly to 'after the New Criticism' than they did to that approach, though I know of no published condemnation of theory, and the existence of one journal, *Arethusa*, from its first issue open to theory, is significant. Hellenists, particularly those with a wider than narrowly literary approach, have been more open than Latinists, where a watered-down New Criticism is still predominant, and students of poetic discourse have been more open than students of prose. See now though, *Poststructuralist Classics*, ed. A. Benjamin (Warwick Studies in Philosophy and Literature, London 1988) and *History as Text*, ed. Averil Cameron (London 1989). Stimulating general treatments are P. de Man, *The Resistance to Theory* (Theory and History of Literature 33 [Minneapolis 1986] and *Against Theory. Literary Studies and the New Pragmatism*, ed. W.J.T. Mitchell (Chicago and London 1985).

68. E.g. V. Lambropoulos, 'Modern Greek Studies at the Crossroads; the Paradigm Shift from Empiricism to Skepticism', *JMGS* 7 (1989) 1-39.

69. J. Haldon, '“Jargon” vs “the Facts”? Byzantine History-Writing and Contemporary Debates', *BMGS* 9 (1984-5) 95-132; R. Cormack, '“New Art History” vs “Old History”: Writing Art History', *BMGS* 10 (1986) 223-231.

70. Unpublished address to the XVII International Congress of Byzantine Studies (Washington 1986).

71. See my *Aristocracy and Patronage* and R. Cormack, *The Byzantine Eye: Studies in Art and Patronage* (London, Variorum 1989) esp. X.

for the future should be resisted. Cyril Mango was right in 1975 about the vital importance of literary texts to all Byzantinists. We must find a way to correct the distortion of the mirror, or we shall be left with the distortions of the mirror of material evidence. It used to be fashionable to contrast the development, and searching out, of material evidence with rereading the Bonn corpus (archaeology good, Bonn corpus bad). At a time when the interpreters of visual evidence seem so far ahead of the interpreters of literary evidence, perhaps the time has come to evolve a reading practice which will make it possible to reread (and reread) not only the Bonn corpus but Byzantine literature as a whole. Yes, There is a Text in This Class.

The Queen's University of Belfast

Literacy as Symbolic Strategy in Greece: Methodological Considerations of Topic and Place

MICHAEL HERZFELD

Against reification: what is a context?

This paper provides me with an opportunity to suggest why the study of orality and literacy/literality in modern Greece has some theoretical as well as purely descriptive or local significance. For social anthropology, comparison between societies and cultures is a central task. While the study of modern Greek culture displays a remarkably persistent level of methodological introversion, its singular characteristics are very germane to the comparativist perspective. In part, this is due to the peculiar political circumstances that make the ancient forebears of the Greeks so much a part of current debates about the status of the modern culture. The ancient culture, which is responsible (blamed?) for some of our current *theoretical* concerns with literate discourse, becomes in the modern Greek context an object of *ethnographic* interest, and the high authority consequently given to the written word in at least one reading of modern Greek culture allows us to see literacy, not as some transcendent standard, but as a manipulable symbol and instrument of power. This suggests that we should study orality and literacy, not as absolute phenomena, but as social values. From here, it is but a short step to the further observation that philological (and other academic) practices in turn themselves become objects of critical ethnographic scrutiny. While an excessive concern with what academic discourse does may indeed smack of narcissistic navel-gazing, a charge that has certainly been levelled at anthropological practitioners, it takes on a degree of justifiable urgency when academic standards themselves become a popular criterion of excellence or absurdity.

Viewed in these terms, the study of orality and literacy in Modern Greece presents some twitching ironies. Paramount

among these, surely, is the curious circumstance — although by no means an uncommon one in the history of Romantic nationalism — whereby an emergent bourgeois intelligentsia expropriated the ‘oral traditions’ of an equally hypostatized ‘folk’ and monumentalized them in order to incorporate them into a peculiar and rigid view of history. The oral utterance did not stand a serious chance of survival in a polity defined by adherence to writing things down. By reducing it to ‘monuments of the word’ (Politis 1909), the intelligentsia set a model of referential purity that suited and reinforced its literalistic interpretation of everything else: law, history, the conduct of political life.

The idea of an oral alternative nevertheless died hard, and exponents of various anti-establishment ideologies tried at various times to rescue it. Demoticism often seems to take orality as an ideal and to invest in it all the moral purity that its adherents attributed to the rural ‘folk’ (see especially Tziovas 1989). The absorption of song into literate poetry implied by the nineteenth-century use of such terms as *asma* underwent a degree of reversal. Even now, however, literacy continues to impose its static perspective: by opposing itself to ‘oral tradition’, it manages to suggest that orality is no less fixed than itself. It is only in such work as that of Deborah Tannen (e.g., 1980, 1982, 1984), whose expertise includes modern Greek, that we begin to see a reversal of this trend, a search for the traces of literacy in oral discourse that goes beyond the older philological tradition of treating ‘oral traditions’ as though they were mere end-products of some diffusionist stemmatics of the *Urtex*t.

In this highly programmatic paper, I would like to suggest an alternative approach. In this, we replace a focus on orality and literacy as essentialistically conceived *qualities* of Greek discourse with a focus on the *uses* of these concepts as symbolic strategies. Before I go on to a discussion of the technical terminology used here, let me illustrate with a very simple example. All scholars of modern Greek know the differences between demotic and *katharevousa*. They are thus inclined to view with academic superciliousness the claims of certain populations (Cypriots, Dodecanesians) to speak *katharevousa* or even ‘Homeric’ Greek. No doubt, at the level of historical accuracy, their objections are justified.

But the use and above all the interpretation of certain archaic-sounding forms, while a good deal less well documented than the 'pronouns of power and solidarity' (Brown and Gilman 1960), are for that very reason an insidiously effective means of highlighting status differences between speaker and listener. Neo-classical *dhioti* carries infinitely more clout than demotic *yati* — unless, of course, the listener decides to puncture the speaker's self-importance.

It would be a mistake, I think, to suggest that the demotic-*katharevousa* contrast glosses the oral-literate with any degree of accuracy. In the first place, the conscious demoticism of much written discourse belies such a claim. So, too, does the formalism of more pretentious speakers. Such a division also overlooks the capacity of Greek diglossia to serve as a vehicle for irony. Rather, it is the *assumption of rule-governedness* that characterizes literate discourse and leads uneducated speakers to treat stilted demotic as *katharevousa*. A pompous demoticist, or even a merely careful one, may be arguably 'puristic' in pursuing ideal forms of the 'real' language of 'the people'. The demoticist revolution, in some of its forms, reproduced the misconception of nineteenth-century folklore: it suppressed the semantic lability of negotiable texts, demanding such strict adherence to canonical forms that the very ambiguity of the text-context distinction, itself an important semantic resource, disappeared from sight. Orality became a *Ding an sich*, so that Apostolakis (1929) could accuse nationalist scholars of having failed to follow the rules of oral composition.

This is not to say that rules are lacking in oral discourse. Grammatical and semantic structures remain highly identifiable. But the rules can be *negotiated* in social interaction, and the rules of syntax dissolve into principles of morality, etiquette, and aesthetics. They become strategies for a variety of social practices, among them the effective projection of power over others (see also Murray 1988: 351,370). Language loses its autonomy. Caraveli (1982) has argued, for example, that songs contain numerous verbal ornaments and implicit meanings that disappear from most professional transcriptions of purely verbal texts, and that this constitutes a semantic impoverishment of those texts. On the other hand, the occasional manipulation of grammatical

gender might suggest that the rule-boundness of formal discourse actually lends it to parody and other forms of expressive manipulation in social life (Herzfeld 1985a: 215-218; 1985b). While it would be hubristic to suggest that only ethnographic contexts can permit semantic access to verbal artifice, these examples do point to a need to break away, not only from purely philological models of semantics and syntax, but also from the literal text-context distinction that replaced these for many folklorists and anthropologists. Reification of 'text' presupposes reification of 'context'; but, as I have argued elsewhere (1985c), the resulting dualism is not only logically unnecessary, but it does not — in Greece, at least — correspond to non-literate models of the production of meaning.

Let me illustrate. When Rhodian or Cretan villagers talk about the meaning (*simasia*) of an assonant distich (*mandinadha*) in terms of its relationship to particular events, they *seem* to be addressing a text-context distinction. But this only holds true if we insist on *assuming* that the 'context' is in some way less 'constructed' than what we call the 'text'. In practice, the singer of a *mandinadha* has to textualize the event from which the *mandinadha*-text derives meaning. *Both* become virtual texts at the moment when the singer creates a meta-text capable of articulating a relationship between them. Because the *mandinadha* tradition has a complex history of interaction with written poetry, in which literate ideology proposes a perspective of transcendent referentiality, it provides an especially illuminating field in which to examine critically the concept of context.

Poetry and the poetics of social interaction

A closely related problem revolves around the term 'poetry'. This is perhaps not the place to rehearse the detailed arguments now under way about the relationship between poetry and poetics. It is worth pointing out, however, that the conflation of these two terms is the direct consequence of a more general failure to recognize language as a form of action, a failure that has been substantially corrected within linguistic anthropology but that has so far lingered on in the study of other expressive domains. It has also persisted somewhat in more traditionally philological con-

cerns. A poetics of social interaction does not privilege language over other semiotic channels and is not — except in terms of intellectual history — a derivative of linguistic models. Although one of the most useful models for analysis is Jakobson's (1960: 356) 'poetic function', for example, it in turn rests on a long history of similar frameworks, particularly in Russian Formalism and Prague School aesthetics, in which verbal art is only one of the many aesthetic domains addressed.

Such a restoration of the action component in poetics should occasion no surprise to neohellenists aware of the Classical Greek derivations of such terms as *poiēsis* and *drama* and their often cited but rarely investigated etymological connection with notions of *doing* or *making* — in short, with causative models. To borrow a phrase from Austin (1975[1962]), the issue is how people 'do things with words'; but it is also whether words are the only means whereby they do these things. The analytical separation of textuality from other modes of action has served the study of orality very badly, and if in some sense the consequent achievement of transcendence offered some practical advantages in technological mastery over the world,¹ it also resulted in a curious blindness to the significance of writing for those amongst whom these reifications have not yet spread their paralyzing conformity.

The failure to appreciate the *poetics of language* (as opposed to the *language of poetry*) derives from the same ideological and methodological confusions as the Cartesian split between the 'embodiments' of orality and the 'transcendence' of the written word. The models are 'ideal types'; they are realized, however, only in the course of their pragmatic negotiation in social life. To approach this dialectic in a manner that will not immediately reduce the discussion once again to arid dualities, we need concepts that will allow us to handle the *uses* of the ideal-type conceptualizations in the ebb and flow of everyday social relations, and in the complex processes of interaction in which bounded verbal texts are but a single kind of component. Two pertinent and closely

1. The enormous range of relevant literature includes: E. Gellner 1988: 71-77; Havelock 1963 and 1986; Humphreys 1978, part 3, esp. p.273; Ong 1977 and 1982.

inter-related concepts that have acquired a good deal of currency in recent anthropological writings are those of *agency* and *strategy*.

Agency is the capacity to *act on* social and cultural reality and to produce change or reinforcement in an existing pattern or structure. As such, it is the social dimension of what linguists, following Austin, have called 'performativity', or 'performative utterances'. It may be a property of social entities at any level from the individual up to the nation-state and beyond. Although agency is prefigured in earlier work in anthropology (see Karp and Maynard 1983), its theoretical elaboration is a comparatively recent development (see Karp 1986). Some discussion of these terms is in order.

Agency presupposes the existence of some form of durable structure. While it was introduced into the anthropological and sociological literature partly as a counter to the excessive reification of structure, it provides the explanatory framework for relating individual strategies to structure. Structure and strategy exist in a mutually complementary, dialectical universe in which each requires the co-operation of the other. Since much recent text analysis has been centred on the investigation of textual structures, one might here raise the question: in what ways do texts serve as vehicles of agency? This is practically tantamount to asking, again with Austin, what they *do*; but it goes beyond Austin's vision in that we now ask *how* they do what they do. Parenthetically, one might observe that philology has generally missed this opportunity to insert inert academic objects into a world where they have practical consequences. One only has to consider the ways in which *mandinadha* contests induce a social re-evaluation of the contestants, or end in fist-fights, or produce a sense of solidary traditionalism against the encroachment of modern mass media, to see that they do indeed have palpable effects in what the most hard-nosed literalists would recognize as the 'real world'. Our appreciation of this phenomenon, however, is contingent upon accepting that the words of the distichs, even when interpreted 'in context', are not, so to speak, the whole story. And it is surely significant in this regard that *istoria*, for Cretan villagers at least (Herzfeld 1985a: 174), can mean physical events as much as it does narrative. Again, we must

beware of habits of thought that conceptually separate utterance from action.

Social agency implies decision-making, and this informs some of the earlier uses of the notion of 'strategy' in anthropology (e.g., Bailey 1971, 1983; Kapferer, ed.1976). But the attribution of intention is probably best left to the actors; indeed, it is often a strategy in its own right, as when Greeks complain that petty bureaucrats act in certain ways from *etsithelismos* (caprice), hoping thereby either to shame their tormentors into a different course of action or to justify their failure to their peers. Such claims presuppose an ideology of individual volition, which is a cultural artefact rather than a universal principle of mind. Sometimes, strategies arise out of the availability of symbolic resources, such as 'ethnicity' (Royce 1982) or 'history' (Appadurai 1981) — far too often treated as hypostatized entities, but more usefully approached in the cited works as *properties* of social interaction. This view runs counter, of course, to the literalism of the state, which translates ethnicity into nationalism, identity into *dheltia taftotitos*, and the relative (and negotiable) social distance of *kseni* into the absolute exclusion of 'others' as 'foreigners'. Such is the link between referentiality and the bureaucratic nation-state, the product of some of the most successful strategies — which it recasts as historical necessity — of all time.

Strategies are the means by which agents realize their effects. They range from the long-term operations of often quite differentiated agents enmeshed in complex power structures, as in Foucault's (1978: 307-308) analysis of discipline, to the pettiest aspects of daily interaction. In the latter sense, they are opposed to *rules*, although the adoption of a rule-like stance — often modelled on literate prototypes — may be a strategy in its own right (Bourdieu 1977: 37-40). Here, the converse strategies of invoking orality as a justification for nativist demoticism or literate, writerly speech as a mark of 'properness' (Kazazis 1966) both fit the same pattern — a warning to those who, in attempting to codify informal speech, risk surrendering to the very strategies that characterize what Bakhtin (1981) and others call 'official' or 'authoritative' discourse.

These concepts are no less prone to reification than what they displace. But the defence that this framework nonetheless potentially offers against the reification of orality and literacy is valuable at least in as much as it distances us from both official and 'officializing' (Bourdieu 1977: 37) strategies and allows us greater freedom to make our analytical and methodological choices.

The poetics of evocation

The social life of a local community is inevitably embedded in much larger processes. Even the most conservative folklorists acknowledged this; indeed, it was a necessary precondition of their massive attempts to reconstitute unified *Urtexte* from the 'variants' they collected. For them, however, the local community was a passive consumer — and textual abuser — of literary work. Later interpretations, mostly of Marxist inspiration, reversed these assumptions (e.g., Lambrinos 1947), but suffered from a similarly unidirectional view of textual influence: the 'folk', no less highly romanticized in these readings, were the producers of a textuality so pure that the practice of writing violated its sensibilities. With the progressive discrediting of *Urtext* models, moreover, came a devaluation of all etymological and derivational models, a devaluation to which anthropologists certainly contributed with their synchronic emphasis on the 'ethnographic present'. One result was that the power of structure to *evoke* the past — a power that for some analysts (e.g., Sperber 1975) represented a failure of (literal) semantics — did not immediately become apparent.

While a few students of Greek folklore have spotted the allusive properties of textual form, (e.g., Alexiou 1974) and while the capacity of folk idioms for conveying irony and parody is now more generally acknowledged (e.g., Danforth 1976, on Karagiozis) the easy shift from the literate word to literal interpretation has generally obscured these relatively imponderable aspects. The fact that, as Sifakis (1988: 12) has recently acknowledged, it is usually too late to rescue the textual material from the learned mountings in which it has been so artificially set means that discussion of 'the' meaning of a text excludes the multiple perspectives of those audiences for which it was produced. It is clear, moreover, that the children of illiterate parents are often socialized into a

lability of semantic understanding that would constitute a veritable philological scandal for the literate (Heath 1983: 190-193): words and things can be reassociated more or less at will, provided this is done against a background of shared assumptions.

In the Greek context, the legalistic insistence upon the premise of referentiality can probably be associated, more convincingly by far than the dubious dualism of the demoticism-purism debate, with what Mouzelis (1978: 134-136) has identified as the 'formalism' of the politically dependent and bureaucratically regimented nation-state structure. Indeed, Goody (1986: 12-13) associated the collapse of segmentary social relations² into state-like political structures with the reification of semantics. Once again, however, it is important to batten firmly on to the elusive but necessary insight that this argument turns on an ideal-type contrast: within any state structure there may continue to exist more or less subversive perceptions of social and political relationships that are much more segmentary in character than they are bureaucratic. Goody himself emphasizes (1986: 32) that writing creates an *impression* of decontextualized meaning; he does not go so far as to suggest that such a thing exists in any ontologically absolute sense. Literary — and even (*sic*!) academic — discourse exhibits segmentary properties; and while these do not overdetermine the production of knowledge (Karp and Maynard 1983: 497) they do raise persistent questions about the reality of our conviction that, with an adequate system of writing, we can 'tie down' the meanings of utterances beyond all ambiguity.

One result of bureaucratic pervasion is a certain loss of categorical innocence. Language itself becomes an object of semantic regulation, the neo-Cratylism of countless bureaucratic Big Brothers. Literacy, the object of the transcendence that Goody calls universalism, isolates language from other domains of action. In consequence, it has become all but inconceivable to regard 'poetics' as anything other than verbocentric: either one treats it as purely focussed on verbal codes (poetry), or one is thought

2. Segmentation, on which there is now an enormous literature in social anthropology, may be defined as the principle of complementary fission and fusion in social relations. It may be realized through a descent system, as in many African societies, or it may appear simply as a relativistic understanding of group allegiance.

to have foisted a linguistic model on the entire range of possible semiotic systems.

Because, moreover, a poetics conceived in these narrower terms inevitably seeks regularity of system rather than of action, it isolates the printed texts of 'folklore' in ways that subvert whatever the original producers intended as its *simasia*. I do not mean that exercises in the extraction of grammatical regularities such as those identified by Sifakis (1988) or Mackridge (this volume) have no value. On the contrary, their ability to generate rules of form affirms the structural aspect, for textual analysis at least, of what Giddens (1984) has called 'the duality of structure' or 'structuration' — that is, the necessary interplay and interdependence of structure and action. In this regard, formal syntactic analyses complement the search for textual strategies. The achievement of both Sifakis and Mackridge is all the more interesting in that the regularities they have identified appear to subsist quite independently of extra-textual considerations of any sort.

What syntactic analyses cannot do, however, is reconstruct *ex nihilo* the strategies that once used the very discipline of syntactic form to generate *simasia*. In other words, they succeed in isolating one component in the production of meaning, and they show how it works. They are important, not because they isolate regularities and so lead us to some putative unconscious patterning, but because they uncover one of the major *resources* that performers have at their disposal. Since such studies do not show how their performance deploys that function in cooperation with other aspects of meaning-production, however, they are not really studies of meaning as such. They investigate, as it were, semantically exploitable properties, rather than semantics *tout court*.

Because philology is — perhaps inevitably — a verbocentric discipline, it accepts with difficulty the extension of a concept of meaning that incorporates as textual those aspects of text production that are usually considered to be 'merely' contextual. But some anthropologists, too, are reluctant to accept that meaning *qua* (social) importance (as in the Greek *dhen ekhi simasia*, 'it doesn't matter') and the meaning of verbal utterances might be treated within a common framework (e.g., Just 1987: 127-128). Such a position argues a refusal to treat language as action, and

thus to take it seriously as a component in the constitution of social relationships. It has the ironic consequence of marginalizing language in exactly the same way, although for very different professional or ideological reasons, as the most conservative forms of philology. The only justification for separating the *simasia* of *mandinadha* texts from the *simasia* of their context or of their allusive range would be the existence of just such a conceptual division of labour in the local canon. This is not borne out by the scanty evidence we still have from the actual performances of Greek folk song (Caraveli [1982] provides some of the most sensitive analysis; see also Cowan 1988 for an especially perceptive exploration of related themes). Rather, it appears to be a misunderstanding born of the continual decontextualization of those performances.

By decontextualization, I do not mean simply the stripping away of context in the traditional sense of that term. Rather, I intend the pervasive disregard that scholarship has exhibited towards the synergistic and synaesthetic properties of actual performance. It would be hard to imagine a Greek singer either so naïve or so far removed from literate models as to be incapable of separating words, music, social context, and accompanying gesture from each other. But if the same singer operates within a tradition that identifies a common *simasia* in all these identifiable domains, what possible justification could we conjure out of our literate prejudices for apportioning the *dissecta membra* of *simasia* among those domains? By doing so, we, not the singers, become guilty of nominalism and reductionism. For all we achieve thereby is a hopeless confusion between types of signifier (words, music, etc.) and classes of signifieds (things that words mean, things that music means, etc.): we simplistically — and illegitimately — assume the existence of the latter because we know that there is a clearly defined division of labour amongst the former. The very closeness of the modern Greek terminology to its Classical roots may further blind us to the important divergences between technical English-language and everyday Greek usages, as may an Anglo-Saxon cultural valuation of the literal over the metaphorical that one does not seem to find so prominently amongst Greeks (Tannen 1978, 1982; see also Chock 1987; but

contrast Mackridge 1985: 348, on the close relationship between Greek literality and the imitation of 'European' models — an effect, relevant to my argument here, of bureaucratization and *embourgeoisement*). Such valuations of literality and figurativeness are, moreover, ideal types. They do not suggest that English-speakers actually use a more literal semantics, but that they appear to uphold a linguistic morality — possibly allied to an affectation of distrust towards punning and other verbal 'cleverness' — in which it is 'just not done,' and certainly unscientific, to be too figurative.

These remarks are intended to suggest the enormous load of cultural specificity through which any analysis of Greek folk song and narrative must work. In order to appreciate the work done by grammarians and other formalists, it is necessary to rethink exactly what that work does. If its major task is seen as identifying unique and irreducible meanings, it certainly fails. But if what it does is to illuminate the symbolic resources on which singers, poets, and storytellers can draw, if (in other words) its contributions are viewed in a context that is not traditional to it, then the pragmatic 'deformations' of verbal discipline in performance can become much more accessible. Textual *form* and the vagaries of *performance* are mutually and inextricably co-involved. Neither, in practice, 'means' very much without the other.

A coda: what to do with the donkey's tail

This paper has been largely theoretical and programmatic so far, although I have tried to suggest some of the special insights and resonances that the study of Modern Greek culture can bring to a consideration of the main issues. It is not my intention here to attempt a full-scale analysis of 'a' text. Instead, as a sort of coda to the main argument, I shall briefly look at a genre of folk text that has rarely even been mentioned in studies of Greek folklore — a silence that has compounded our ignorance about the principles of meaning production if not about textual composition.

This genre, which is found in the rural communities of Western Crete, consists of assonant distichs strung together along a roughly narrative axis and linked by a theme of apparently parodic lamen-

tation. The texts describe the reactions of individual villagers to the death of a pack animal (mule, donkey) or, less often, an animal raised for food but not as part of a flock (pig, ox). The villagers are represented as discussing the division of the meat — a morally whimsical notion, since the eating of carrion is forbidden (Herzfeld 1985a: 148).

These texts are primary candidates for exclusion from the official canon. They are utterly local and personal in reference; they more generously use local dialect forms (e.g., the first person plural present tense verb ending *-oumene*, for *-oume*); and they dwell lovingly on such unseemly behaviour as quarreling, farting, and heavy drinking. They have no obvious historical antecedent, since the 'honourable ass' of the Renaissance texts is not only a survivor but an intelligent one at that. There is nothing to commend them to the survivalist collectors of the nationalist tradition. They are a bleak illustration of the fate of nonliterate invention at the hands of a literacy strongly linked to criteria of etiquette. Their *simasia* is to be found so preponderantly in what the scholarly tradition calls 'context' that the literate criteria of folklore analysis effectively screen out their very existence. For the ontology of literate textuality depends entirely on the idea of a transcendent history and culture, and so aggressively 'particularistic' (Goody 1986) a tradition — one in which transcendence itself is arguably an object of fun — simply fails to register. The brief discussion that follows is based on examples from the village which I have pseudonymously called 'Glendi'.³

3. For reasons that relate to the nature of my fieldwork, I am continuing the practice of disguising the personal identities of both my informants and the characters whose exploits they purport to parody. This makes for a good deal of awkwardness in the reproduction of textual materials, which I shall consequently keep to the minimum needed to make some critical points, trying also, wherever possible, to use examples where this manoeuvre will not be necessary. The authors of these texts are extremely lively personalities, although there is some dispute among them as to who composed which verses. I certainly have no intention of erasing their individuality; the decision to use pseudonyms in this work was a tactical decision which I discussed with several villagers. Nonetheless, I am uncomfortably aware of the irony that it creates, and I hope later consultation may permit the removal of this 'cover'.

Texts often begin with a brief statement about the event that is supposed to have taken place:⁴

Ο [name] τον εσκότωσε το γαϊδαρο στ' αμπέλι
κ' έκατσε και τον έκλαιγε σαν το μωρό κοπέλι.
Μιά σκαλιδιά του βρόντηξε και κάτω τονε βάνει
και το ευτύς εντάκαρε λιβάνι να του πιάνει.

[Name] killed the ass in the vineyard,
and he sat and bewailed it like a baby child.
He slashed at it with a hoe and sent it tumbling down
and immediately went to get incense to wave over it.

Villagers may recite single distichs. More commonly, however, they either, metonymically, recite the first few words, or they may produce the entire sequence; in either case, they show a clear perception of the bounded existence of the text in itself.

The model is that of literary production. The speaker is a *piitis*, and he 'writes' the words — turning them over and over in his head at night, as one such individual told me, until he can produce an effective sequence in public. Thus, the non-literate production of these texts takes literate methods of composition as its model. Phrases are modelled on familiar folk-song imagery and written formulae. For example, one phrase —

Ο [name] επρόβαλε απ' [sic] το παραθύρι,
Κοντέψετε μου ένα κιλό γιατί 'χω μουσαφίρη.

[Name] leaned out of a window:
'Bring me a kilo, as I have a guest!'

— reproduces a standard formula known from a huge variety of song sources (Herzfeld 1973: 424-428; Sifakis 1988: 104-105).

In what ways such usages might be parodic remains obscure. Contrary, perhaps, to one's armchair imaginings, an ethnographer would not be able to elicit a satisfactory response to this question simply by asking. Leading questions are not a way to generate

4. The texts were taken down with pen in hand, so I have not here specifically emphasized the phonetic characteristics of Cretan in the transcriptions.

convincing evidence. To some extent, moreover, we must recognize the ambiguous intertextuality of these verses as an important characteristic of their production — not the kind of reading that satisfies any essentialist quest for textual meaning. In another sense, however, the verses do seem to be parodic: they caricature the proclivities, gender roles, and speech patterns of fellow-villagers. These male poets almost invariably represent women as scolding peacemakers who despise the men's quarrelling. The texts thus at least suggest that a capacity for parody exists. In that their form closely follows that of well-known texts, it is likely that, in *some* situations and at *some* moments, singers do intentionally parody more formal textual conventions through these verses.

But do they parody specifically *written* conventions? That is much harder to answer, the more so in as much as the stylistic shibboleths that divide written from oral texts for traditionally minded scholars are themselves unclear and complicated by tangled processes of mutual influence. There is a hint at least that 'writing', while externally the image of power *par excellence*, is for many villagers an 'unmanly' activity to which the weak have recourse as their only possible source of authority. Indeed, one of these texts mocks a very short young man who, unable to help carry the carcass, is charged with writing down in his notebook (*tefteri*) the amounts and parts of the carcass assigned to each villager. This is also the poet's symbolically stated medium, although in practice he did not actually use one.

Beyond literacy, there is also some straightforward mockery of the proprieties:

Ένας μακρύς, καλά μακρύς, είπενε την αλήθεια —
 Εγώ δεν έτυχα 'παδά κι αφήστε μου τ' αρχίδια.
 Και ο [name] τού 'πενε, Δεν είν' αυτές κουβέντες,
 τ' αρχίδια θα τα ψήσουμε να κάμουμε μεζέδες.
 Μεζέδες θα τα κάμωμε, ένα κρασί να πιούμε,
 απίς τονε μοιράσουμε για να ξεκουραστούμε.

A tall fellow, very tall, said the truth:
 'I didn't happen to be there, [so] leave me the balls!'
 And [name] told him, 'That's not the way to talk —

we'll roast the balls so we'll have some snacks.
We'll turn them into snacks, so's to drink a glass of wine,
after we've divided it up, so we can relax.'

Social conventions and realities are mocked in other ways as well. The poet's activity is a sort of test of temper; he must be careful, because everyone knows that the genre is intended to tease:

Του [name] ψόφησε το κόκκινο μουλάρι
και δεν ευρέθηκε κανείς τραγούδια να του βγάλει.
Ο [poet's name] εκατέβηκε, εις το ντουκιάνι πάει,
για [sic] του εφορτωθήκανε τραγούδι να του βγάλει.
Να του το βγάλω θέλω 'γώ μα θέλω να σκεφτείτε,
αν είν' και του κακοφανεί να του επιτεθείτε.

[Name]'s red mule died
and no one could be found to sing songs about it.
[Name] went down there, goes to the coffeehouse,
and they all set on him to make up a song about it.
'I'll make up one about it, but I want you to gather your wits about you,
and if he gets upset you're to attack him!'

Above all, the verses mock villagers' known peculiarities: one immediately looks for the wine that will be needed to go with the 'food'; another wants the skin as a mattress for his enormous brood of children; yet another wants the donkey's tail as a fly-switch. These attributions may seem innocuous enough. They are always potentially dangerous, however, in a community where slight advantages in the endless contest over prestige may have real consequences for a family's economic and social condition. The poet must be careful: writing things down makes them permanent, and a man (especially) who feels unsure of himself may respond with violence. His strength will eventually be shown to best advantage, however, if he learns to bear these needling insults as a mark of pride, just as many men who begin by reacting touchily to derisive nicknames eventually boast of them and even place them — 'write' them, be it noted — on the sides of their personal vehicles (see Herzfeld 1985a: 234).

In mocking the internal power-mongers of the village, moreover, these poets may be commenting indirectly on the community's collective sense of powerlessness before the forces of law and urbanity. The very innocuousness of the subject-matter allows this kind of indirection (see also Trawick 1988: 197 for an analogous observation in a Tamil community). It may well be the case — but how can one be sure? — that the very notion of carrion-eating is a bitter allusion to the poverty that the villagers claim has always beset them. 'Hunger' is a constant and manipulable metaphor for economic poverty and political marginalization, and memories of wartime deprivation — when a live donkey might indeed be slaughtered for meat — lend some force to this suggestion.

In Glendi, moreover, poets are not usually the most powerful of men. Indeed, the only case I encountered of a man who had enjoyed real economic and political power and who turned to the composition of verse, did so in his dotage, when he became the object of slightly pitying fun and when his displays of emotion were considered a mark of his age and enfeeblement (Herzfeld 1985a: 9-10). 'Writing' may come to some as a compensation for the lack or loss of other, more tangible forms of power. Villagers perceive a real link between the writing of verse and the more threatening 'writing' that characterizes the activity of bureaucrats. Writing brings a kind of permanence, so that a man's willingness to tolerate the existence of derisive verses about his character, even in an oral 'archive', comes with the same self-confidence that also leads him — as often happens with the swashbuckling Glendiots — to commit acts of cheeky defiance against the law and its representatives (such as inviting policemen to eat stolen meat at his table). A poet's 'writing', actually a carefully prepared oral recitation in the coffee-house, is the source of both his pride and his fear. The fact that we cannot tell if his style is imitative or parodic of any literary prototypes is immaterial here. Writing, for the Glendiots, is less importantly a matter of aesthetic style in the abstract than it is of the poetics of social interaction in the sense in which I have discussed that term above — in this case, the ambiguous play of power. It is truly ambiguous, moreover: despite the exaggerated respect for 'writing' that the

poets display, villagers in general do not necessarily think that books and learning are terribly useful:

Μη θαρρευτείς μαθήτριάς γιατί θα σε γελάσει,
όπως την άλγεβρα ξεχνά έτσι θα σε ξεχάσει.

Don't have faith in a schoolgirl, because she'll deceive you.
Just as she forgets her algebra, so she'll forget you!

It is true that a 'carrion poet' may describe the scenes of weeping and wailing that attend the animal's demise in language more conventionally associated with lamenting (*miroloya*) for the human dead. The description of grief more closely resembles the written poems of Bounialis, and those of his modern successors who bewailed the horrors (for example) of the German Occupation, than it does the Glendiot laments (which are in an entirely different metrical scheme). But these poems in turn have many oral parallels, and it is impossible to disengage the various trajectories of influence from each other so long after the fact.

But the question of textual influence is secondary here. I have tried to suggest that it is even something of a red herring. The orality-literacy opposition can, of course, be reduced to a question of formal stylistics, just as the demotic-*katharevousa* pair can (and often is) be treated as simply a contrast between two different lexica and two sharply differentiated morphological and syntactic systems. But such formulations, in their insistent focus on precise structures and literal meanings, miss the ambiguity that is empirically an important aspect of virtually all social life (see Fernandez 1986). It makes very little sense to talk about the importance of (social and cultural) context for the analysis of texts if (a) that division rides roughshod over local perceptions of how meaning is made, and (b) the ambiguity of social relations is itself screened out by the scholasticism of the analysis. I am well aware that some readers will be uncomfortable with this argument, which resolves nothing. There is no obvious conclusion; we leave the scene with more questions than answers. But this is at least faithful to the social experience of participants, who do not know whether the targets will be angry or secretly flattered; who are not sure

who will be mocked next; and who do not ordinarily trouble themselves with anxieties of influence although they do worry about the power of the bureaucratic pen. As Trawick observes in connection with her Tamil materials (1988: 195), what is analytically needed — and what traditional methods do not make available to us — is '[n]ot only a theoretical bridge, but a phenomenological one, a widened area of shared experience.'

This returns us, finally, to a point I made earlier about literate and oral semantics. The assumption of referentiality, which is the semantic equivalent of the essentialist arguments of nationalistic folklore, does not fit the evidence of everyday usage. Meaning is evanescent. The attempt to pin it down, like an entomological specimen, therefore violates usage. It is certainly true that much of the oral verse with which philologists have been concerned has been decontextualized in precisely this way; the fault is not usually that of present-day analysts. But that does not mean that we cannot recognize the lacuna as an extremely serious one. The syntactic regularities identified by Mackridge and Sifakis, which the 'carrion poems' almost certainly display to the full, provide us with the yardstick whereby we may assure ourselves that the poets indeed know what they are doing. But that discipline is the means of foregrounding meaning; it is not the meaning itself. If we have not previously asked why 'carrion poems' sound like the great threnodies of Bounialis and Sifakas, that is because the scholarly tradition has excluded the disrespectful oral texts and thereby circumvented the very possibility of comparison. In the social context of power and scholarly knowledge, texts that seem non-referential (or non-transcendent, or particularistic) too easily lose their *simasia* — their meaning *and* their importance. At that moment, we lose sight of the unity of *simasia* so clearly perceived by the Greek villagers whose texts we presume to discuss. The analysis must consequently lack any *simasia* of its own.

In short, the value of formal analysis is precisely that it helps us understand how meaning is produced, not that it explains meaning as such. In the absence of all the other contributing dimensions of social life, however, I find myself composing a threnody myself — one that echoes Sifakis' justly regretful acknowledge-

ment that in many respects it is already too late to attempt the composite analysis that we need. All we are left with is the grammar and the words: the bones without the life. The self-conscious orality that still peeks through as a convention in literary texts is no less formulaic, and no less devoid of immediate social *simasia*, than the dessicated lines of 'folk verse', divorced from melody and society, that we find in the pages of books. The impossibility of a fully-fledged poetics in the extended sense I have suggested here leaves us only with the fragments of a verbal complex we recognize as, merely, poetry. In any investigation that is sensitive to the shades of a past audience, that precious remnant should instil a grievous sense of both intellectual and aesthetic loss. All we can now do, and it is not trivial, is to analyze extant styles of oral composition in a manner that is more responsive to the overall production of meaning.

Indiana University

References

- Alexiou, M.B. 1974. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, (Cambridge).
 Apostolakis, Y. 1929. Τα δημοτικά τραγούδια: οι συλλογές (Athens).
 Appadurai, A. 1981. 'The past as a scarce resource', *Man* (N.S.) 16: 201-219.
 Austin, J.L. 1975 [1962] *How To Do Things With Words*, ed. J.O. Urmson and Marina Sbisa (Cambridge, Mass.).
 Bailey, F.G. 1971. *Gifts and Poison: The Politics of Reputation* (Oxford).
 Bailey, F.G. 1983. *The Tactical Uses of Passion: An Essay on Power, Reason, and Reality* (Ithaca).
 Bakhtin, M.M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination* (Austin). Trans. by C. Emerson and M. Holquist.
 Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge). Trans. by R. Nice.
 Brown, R. and Gilman, A. 1960. 'The pronouns of power and solidarity', in T.A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language* (Cambridge, Mass.) 253-276.
 Caraveli, A. 1982. 'The song beyond the song: Aesthetics and social interaction in Greek folksong', *Journal of American Folklore* 95: 129-158.
 Chock, P.P. 1987. 'The irony of stereotypes: Toward an anthropology of ethnicity', *Cultural Anthropology* 2: 347-368.
 Cowan, J.K. 1988. *Embodiments: The Social Construction of Gender in Dance Events in a Northern Greek Town*. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington; forthcoming, Princeton.
 Danforth, L.M. 1976. 'Humour and status reversal in Greek shadow theatre', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 2: 99-111.

- Fernandez, J.W. 1986. *Persuasions and Performances: The Play of Tropes in Culture* (Bloomington).
- Foucault, M. 1978. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York). Trans. by A. Sheridan.
- Gellner, E. 1988. *Plough, Sword and Book: The Structure of Human History* (London).
- Giddens, A. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Introduction to the Theory of Structuration* (Cambridge).
- Goody, J. 1986. *The Logic of Writing and the Organization of Society* (Cambridge).
- Havelock, E.A. 1963. *Preface to Plato* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Havelock, E.A. 1986. *The Muse Learns to Write: Reflections on Orality and Literacy from Antiquity to the Present* (New Haven and London).
- Heath, S.B. 1983. *Ways With Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms* (Cambridge).
- Herzfeld, M. 1973. '“The Siege of Rhodes” and the ethnography of Greek oral tradition', *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 25: 413-440.
- Herzfeld, M. 1985a. *The Poetics of Manhood: Contest and Identity in a Cretan Mountain Village* (Princeton, N.J.).
- Herzfeld, M. 1985b. 'Gender pragmatics: Agency, speech, and bride-theft in a Cretan mountain village', *Anthropology* 9: 25-44.
- Herzfeld, M. 1985c. 'Interpretations from within: Metatext for a Cretan quarrel', in M.B. Alexiou and V. Lambropoulos (eds.), *The Text and its Margins: Post-Structuralist Approaches to Twentieth-Century Greek Literature* (New York) 197-218.
- Humphreys, S.C. 1978. *Anthropology and the Greeks* (London).
- Jakobson, R. 1960. 'Linguistics and poetics', in T.A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language* (Cambridge, Mass.) 350-377.
- Just, R. 1987. Review of Herzfeld 1985a. *Canberra Anthropology* 10: 126-128.
- Kapferer, B. (ed.) 1976. *Transaction and Meaning: Directions in the Anthropology of Exchange and Symbolic Behavior* (Philadelphia).
- Karp, I. 1986. 'Agency and social theory: A review of Anthony Giddens', *American Ethnologist* 13: 131-137.
- Karp, I. and Maynard, K. 1983. 'Reading *The Nuer*', *Current Anthropology* 24: 481-503.
- Kazazis, K. 1966. 'Sunday Greek', in *Papers for the Fourth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society* (Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago) 130-140.
- Lambrinos, G. 1947. Το δημοτικό τραγούδι (Athens).
- Mackridge, P. 1985. *The Modern Greek Language: a Descriptive Analysis of Standard Modern Greek* (Oxford).
- Mouzelis, N. 1978. *Modern Greece: Facets of Underdevelopment* (London).
- Murray, D. 1988. 'The context of oral and written language: A framework for mode and medium switching', *Language in Society* 17: 351-373.
- Ong, W.J. 1977. *Interfaces of the Word: Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness and Culture* (Ithaca, N.Y.).
- Ong, W.J. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London and New York).
- Politis, N.G. 1909. 'Η λαογραφία', *Λαογραφία* 1: 3-18.
- Royce, A.P. 1982. *Ethnic Identity: Strategies of Diversity* (Bloomington).
- Sifakis, G. 1988. Για μια ποιητική του ελληνικού δημοτικού τραγουδιού (Iraklio).

MICHAEL HERZFELD

- Sperber, D. 1975. *Rethinking Symbolism* (Cambridge).
- Tannen, D. 1978. 'A cross-cultural study of oral narrative style', *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (Berkeley) 640-650.
- Tannen, D. 1980. 'Implications of the oral/literate continuum for cross-cultural communication', in J.E. Alatis (ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1980: Current Issues in Bilingualism* (Washington, D.C.) 326-347.
- Tannen, D. 1982. 'The oral/literate continuum in discourse', in D. Tannen (ed.), *Spoken and Written Language* (Norwood, N.J.) 1-16.
- Tannen, D. 1984. *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends* (Norwood, N.J.).
- Trawick, M. 1988. 'Spirits and voices in Tamil songs', *American Ethnologist* 15: 193-215.
- Tziovas, D. 1989. 'Residual orality and belated textuality in Greek literature and culture', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 7: 321-335.

Musicality in Modern Greek Poetry 1900-1930

CHRISTOPHER ROBINSON

In the late nineteenth century in France, a division arose between two concepts of poetry: poetry as a distinct form of expression, and poetry as a distinct form of perception. In the former the musicality of the poem was a primary feature: in the latter the aural value of the text was relatively unimportant. This division is crudely reflected in the critical commonplace which divides twentieth-century Greek poetry into two streams:

a) musical poetry — usually meaning a fluid, perhaps rather facile form of verse intended for the ear, identified with Palamas and ‘the school of Palamas’. The same attention to musicality is seen as resurfacing, albeit in a modified form, in the work of Elytis and Ritsos;

b) visual poetry, written for the eye, more concerned with the shape of words upon the page than with their aural value — a form of poetry supposedly initiated by Cavafy. The poetry of Karyotakis, despite its more conventional metrics, is associated with this ‘poetry for the eye’, because of its laconicism.

In this paper I wish to suggest, with reference to examples of poetry by Palamas, Chatzopoulos, Cavafy and Karyotakis, that there is in fact no such division into ‘aural’ and ‘visual’ poetry in the early years of the century. Musical patterning is a fundamental technique in all four poets. In so far as we find significant differences, they lie in the *application* and *functions* of musical effects.

There are two ways in which music can enter a poem. The first is through metrical constraints: i) rhythm, ii) end-rhyme and internal rhyme. For lack of space I shall largely neglect this aspect here, not because I consider it less important but because I consider it less overlooked than the second source of musicality. This

is sound-patterning.¹ By sound-patterning I mean not just alliteration or assonance, but all forms of repetition of a phoneme or group of phonemes. As Graham Chesters has pointed out in his study of sound-patterning in Baudelaire: 'If a phoneme is repeated several times, even without the consistent accompaniment of stress, then, not surprisingly, the pattern will draw attention to itself.'² As I shall demonstrate, phonemic repetition is a significant feature in all four poets. Clearly, formal patterns of this sort could be ornamental (i.e. without relevance to the semantic content of the poem). What interests me is to establish how far, and in what way, they are *functional* — a part of the process of creating the poem's meaning. At its simplest level the function can be the reinforcement of a *theme* of sound which is overtly stated in the poem. A classic example is the opening lines of Palamas's poem 'Ανατολή' —

Γιαννιώτικα, σμυρνιώτικα, πολίτικα
μακρόσυρτα τραγούδια ανατολίτικα,
λυπητερά —

where the repeated *-otika/-itika* terminations and the patterns in *t* and *r* in μακρόσυρτα/τραγούδια and λυπητερά mirror the trailing music which they represent as well as binding together the whole group of grammatical elements — noun plus series of adjectives — as a unified symbol of the Greek East. But the more subtle and elaborate the relationship between sound, syntax and sense is, the more integral to the poem the function of the musical elements becomes. It is this suggestive function which William Empson has in mind when he says of sound-patterning: 'I think myself its most important mode of action is to connect two words by similarity of sound so that you are made to think of their possible connections.'³

1. The methodology used in my analyses, which has already been applied in my *C.P. Cavafy* (Bristol 1988), has developed from that pioneered by Massimo Peri in *Quattro saggi su Kavafis* (Milan 1979).

2. G. Chesters, *Some Functions of Sound-repetition in 'Les Fleurs du Mal'* (University of Hull Occasional Papers in Modern Languages No.11) (Hull 1975) 44.

3. W. Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (1930: repr. London 1961) 12.



1) Let us start with an example of what most people mean by musical poetry. I have chosen a short poem by Chatzopoulos, entitled 'Φθινόπωρο'. [For text, see Appendix, A.] In its images it is directly derivative from post-Verlaine French symbolist poetry: autumn, last blossoms, last scent, last leaves = sense of death, sense of spiritual and emotional loss, sense of hopelessness for the future. Like its French equivalents, it is in short lines, the governing metrical feature here being the two stresses which shift within the lines, which vary in syllable length from five to seven syllables. Beyond this the whole focus of effect in the poem is thrown onto its sound patterns.

1) If we take the consonants of the first line, we shall see how they govern the pattern of sound in the following four:

‘Άσε το φθινόπωρο.

Key consonants σ, τ, θ, ν, π, ρ (i.e. all except φ):

σ: ‘Άσε, σου, στρώση, στερνά

τ: το, στρώση, τ’ άνθη, τα, στερνά

θ: φθινόπωρο, τ’ άνθη, πεθαίνει

ν: φθινόπωρο, να, τ’ άνθη, στερνά, πεθαίνει, περνά

π: φθινόπωρο, γύρω, στρώση, στερνά, περνά

ρ: φθινόπωρο, γύρω, στρώση, στερνά, περνά

2) In addition to these single-consonant patterns, there are

(a) consonant groups: στ — στρώση, στερνά,

(b) patterns of two consonants within a word: π/ν — πεθαίνει, πνοή, περνά,

(c) patterns of vowel + consonant: πε — πεθαίνει, περνά.

3) We have an example of internal rhyme: ζωή/πνοή.

4) Notice the use of parallel vowel placings, the second example combining with a consonant group:

(a) penultimate ω: φθινόπωρο

στρώση

(b) antepenultimate α + στ: να στρώση

τα στερνά

In a sense it is hardly worth analysing what elements are inter-related by this patterning, since the effect is to connect everything with everything else — the vocabulary of the person (άσε, σου) links to the action of the personified autumn (στρώση), and to the quality of the aspects of nature acted upon by autumn (στερνά): autumn itself (φθινόπωρο) is at the same time linked to the natural phenomena (τ' άνθη τα στερνά) and to its own effect upon them (πεθαίνει, περνά). As a result, the metaphorical implications of 11. 4-5 are strengthened — they refer both to the death of the season and to the spiritual, emotional — even physical — death facing the person. This is a clear case of incantatory use of music to give a deliberate sense of uniformity. At the same time, the harmoniousness is in accord with the mood of resignation portrayed. The obvious parallel is Verlaine's

Les chansons longs
Des violons
De l'automne
Blessent mon coeur
D'une langueur
Monotone.⁴

*

II) It is only a short step from this sort of insistent musical repetition to the kind of patterning-for-emphasis found in, for example, the first five stanzas of section 5 of Palamas's *Οι Χαιρετισμοί της Ηλιογέννητης* [See Appendix, B]. The images of these five stanzas are concerned with the effect of the Heliyennete on her surroundings. Look at the role of the consonants in establishing formal connections. In the first stanza β, π, λ, κ/χ, ρ and θ/δ:

β:	βοσκοπούλα linked to βουνά, βλαχοπούλα linked to καλύβια, all four interlinked, + μολύβια
λ:	βοσκοπούλα, βλαχοπούλα, καλύβια, λιθάρια, σάλεψαν, μολύβια
κ/χ:	βοσκοπούλα, βλαχοπούλα, καλύβια, χτύπησε, καρδιά

4. The first stanza of Verlaine's 'Chanson d'automne', from the 'Paysages tristes' section of *Poèmes saturniens* (1866). Similar devices are used throughout the poem.

π: βοσκοπούλα, βλαχοπούλα, χτύπησε
 ρ and θ/δ: καρδιά, λιθάρια, φτερά (picking up the two
 ήρθα).

Lines 1-2 are very simple in meaning. The fact that the sound system of 11. 3-4 is an extension of that in 1-2 helps the reader to accept the metaphorical meaning of 11. 3-4.

The sound system of the first stanza also establishes the key to the music of the next four stanzas:

κ/χ: κάποιο, και κατέβη, χάρη, σκουλήκι, μαλάκωσε,
 σκοπό, σκορπούν, λύκοι (notice the sub-group σκ)
 π: κάποιο, σκοπό, σκορπούν, που (notice the κ/π pattern)
 λ: λόγγοι, σκουλήκι, μαλάκωσε, ουρλιάζοντας, λύκοι
 ρ: χάρη, ρυθμός, σκορπούν, ουρλιάζοντας

The β has more or less disappeared (it is present only in κατέβη) but patterns in μ (μαλάκωσε, ρυθμός) and σ (μαλάκωσε, ρυθμός, σκοπό, σκορπούν, ουρλιάζοντας) have been added, introducing the new thematic area — connection of nouns 'rhythm' and 'tune' with verbs 'soften' and 'scatter'.

The third and fourth stanzas sustain the principal consonantal colour of the first two:

κ/χ: κάποιο, κρυσταλλένια, ολάνοιχτα, γλυκοξαφνιασμένα,
 κύκλωσαν, βασιλικά, χερουβικά (with β in the last two)
 π: κάποια, απέραντα, παλάτια, παιδιών, πνεύματα,
 πλήθια, σπιθόβολες, παραμύθια
 λ: κρυσταλλένια, παλάτια, ολάνοιχτα, γλυκο-
 ξαφνιασμένα, κύκλωσαν, βασιλικά, σπιθόβολες,
 πλήθια.

There is a consequent isolation of words not belonging to the main sound-system: in stanza 3, although γλυκο- in γλυκοξαφνιασμένα has two common elements, ξαφνιασμένα itself does not. Similarly there is an isolation of new sound series: e.g. in stanza 4 there is a series in θ (πλήθια, σπιθόβολες, θησαυροφόρα, παραμύθια), and in stanza 5 a series in τ (τρανά, νεραϊδογέννητα, τραγούδια).

Eventually the sound system contrives not only to establish relationships within lines and stanzas but across stanzas, so that the shepherdess in the mountains, the cry of the wolves, the endless

crystal palace and the παραμύθια are all part of *one* system. This will in fact continue to the end of section 5, the last two lines of which contain κ, ρ, λ, π and τ:

Την κρυφότετην ηλιοπηγή
που πρωτόσπειρεν εμένα

Within this overall pattern we can see individual functions:

- i) Patterns linking words in close semantic relationship:
βοσκοπούλα/βουνά, απέραντα/παλάτια.
- ii) Patterns linking words without close semantic relationship (creating surprise) — in particular the linking of metaphorical language in 11. 3-8 to conventional language in 11. 1-2: As Chesters observes: 'Imagery and sound-repetition both represent the tendency towards equivalence which has been seen as characteristic of poetry.'⁵ Accordingly, if you tie your imagery through sound to the rest of the poem, you strengthen the poetic power of the image. With this we can compare the use of patterns to link parts of imagery: for instance, in stanza 4, the simile in the second line is bound into the rest of the stanza by musical connections.
- iii) patterns linking words in close grammatical connection — e.g. noun to adjective: θησαυροφόρα παραμύθια.

If we look at the types of sound unit used, we see that there are both initial sound repetitions (i.e. alliteration) and internal repetitions — the poem has a network of both, but the alliterative effects are very strong (more so than in 'Φθινόπωρο'). As in the Chatzopoulos poem key words use more than one of the key sounds: βοσκοπούλα, βλαχοπούλα — σκουλήκι, μαλάκωσε.

Note too that this is a poem with conventional rhythm and rhyme: the sound-patterning is used to echo and emphasise these pre-existing structures.

*

III) It would be unfair, however, to suppose that the range and effect of musical patterning in Palamas is limited to the sort of

5. Chesters, *op. cit.* 68.

writing illustrated above. Compare the freer and more far-reaching function of the same sort of effects in the opening of the *Δωδεκάλογος του Γύφτου*, Canto 1, 11. 1-15 [See Appendix, C.].

This is a passage of ‘vers libéré’ (metrical verse not conforming to traditional verse patterns), with limited use of rhyme as a structuring device: principally

A λευκότη

B αυτή

A πρώτη

B χαραυγή

Also 11. 9 αεράκι

12 αεράκι

15 Θράκη

and 11. 11 πευκώνων

14 χρόνων

Otherwise the basic shaping device of the passage is its musical patterning. Look at lines 1-5:

a) the rhymes — the words are all part of the same visual element/theme and could make a self-standing poem.

b) the other consonant patterns — there are also patterns on χ, λ and τ/δ:

χ: χαράζει, νυχτοφέρνοντας, χαραυγή — the musical connection of the words for dawn with the word νυχτοφέρνοντας (‘having something of the night about it’) strengthens the paradox;

λ: λιγνή, λευκότη — music used to strengthen grammatical connection;

then τ/δ: τ’ αξειδιάλυτα σκοτάδια — where the pattern also strengthens the noun/adjective link, and again the vocabulary of dawn is tied into a pattern which includes the vocabulary of night.

In lines 6-15 the following patterns stand out:

1) κ/χ: μελιχρότατη, χυμένο, χαϊδευτικό, έρχεται, κάτι, αεράκι.

Thus the ‘music’ of dawn is continued, linking its effects to the comparative simile in 11. 8-11.

2) μ/τ/λ/π and μπ:

γιομάτο από τα μπάλσαμα
πρωινά των ολοπράσινων πευκώνων.

This is a deliberate piece of mirroring of the theme of harmony in the musical effect of the words conveying it.

3) π continues in *πέρα κάπου*, *πηγή* and is helped by the λ/. . . όνων pattern to connect lines 11-14 (i.e. it is part of a π/λ/. . . όνων pattern in those lines).

4) Finally, note the dramatic arrival of *Θράκη* to rhyme with *αεράκι*. Dramatic because in a regular rhyme scheme the first member of the rhyming pair 'predicts' the second in some measure, whereas here we have no reason to predict a rhyme for any given end-word.

Very well, you will say. We all know that Chatzopoulos and Palamas use music in their verse. Evidently they do so in various ways and with various degrees of subtlety. So what?

*

IV) Well, let us set against what we have already seen the use of patterns in Karyotakis's *Ίδανικοί αυτόχειρες* [See Appendix, D].

In stanza 1, 11. 1-2, alliteration on π draws attention to, and thereby dramatises, the actions by relating nouns to the verb. This effect is strengthened by supporting sound patterns in τ, ρ, λ, γ, μ:

τ:	στην πόρτα, γράμματά τους
ρ:	πόρτα, παίρνουν, γράμματα
λ:	παλιά, φυλαγμένα
γ and μ:	φυλαγμένα, γράμματα.

In 11. 3-4 there are two separate musical effects: the pattern on τ in *έπειτα/τελευταία/βήματά τους*, linking action and temporality, and the combined syntactic and rhythmic effect of using verb + trisyllabic adverb with antepenultimate stress in the first part of 1. 3 and the inversion of the same structure in the second.

In stanza 3 the same sort of linkage returns to similar effect: (a) σ/τ/κ connect the verbs, so that actions continue to be part

of a process/series, and therefore, eventually, losing their naturalness can be seen as theatrical.

(b) The place where the would-be suicides watch is connected with what they watch:

π παράθυρο, παιδιά, πέρα, σφυροκοπάνε
 ρ: παράθυρο, πέρα, σφυροκοπάνε
 θ/δ: παράθυρο, παιδιά

There is an apparent clash in tying all this into the 'last sunset' in the fourth line of the stanza, but this is of course resolved by, and a preparation for, the last line of the poem.

Stanza 5 has its own patterns on β/λ/θ and τ, and some consonant + vowel patterns:

βα: αναβάλουν, βάθος
 λα: τρέλα, λάθος, όλα
 ωρ/ρω: ώρα, ρωτούν.

The irony of the supposed last actions is heightened by linking them to the sound system of the final line, and by connecting the sound system of 1. 2 to 1. 3 via τ and λα. Karyotakis deliberately creates false connectives between the image in the mirror, the whisper to the self and the final conviction of postponement, to underline the final bathos.

One's first reaction is to account for these aural patterns by saying that precisely because this is an ironic poem, it uses the musical structure of a different type of verse as one of its ways to create contrast — i.e. the style of the poem, by identifying its content with a false rhetoric or sentimentalism, warns the reader of the insincerity of the would-be suicides. I should like to think this was the case, and indeed there *is* an element of formal satire of this kind in Karyotakis's *Satires*. But this is not an unusual style in Karyotakis. Take, for example, the first stanza of 'Δέντρα μου. . .' and 'Είμαστε κάτι. . .' [See Appendix E and F]. In the former the sound system, with its patterns of μ and στ/κ/χ, sets up straightforward identification of the trees with the speaker, and links adjectives to nouns and to one another. Repetition of the same tonic vowel, reinforced by a consonantal repetition, δ, links trees, state, and time of year: Δέντρα μου, δέντρα ξέφυλλα

στη νύχτα του Δεκέβρη. The patterns here show no great complexity or subtlety: they are simple, obvious patterns dominated by alliterative effects.

In 'Είμαστε κάτι ξεχαρβαλωμένες κιθάρες' the musical effects are much more elaborate. The opening lines are marked by patterns of με/εμ, κ/χ, αν/να, αρ, δ and ιχ. In addition the initial vowel in each line is the same, and there is an association of sounds with placing/rhythm. As a result we get an identification of *we* with the image. The initial vowel pattern links *we*, the metaphorical guitars and the sound produced by the guitars. The other patterns then link the two parts of the metaphor:

κιθάρες, στίχους, ήχους, χορδές, κρέμονται, καδένες.

Within lines there are further special links: of the wind to its action of passing, of the strings to the simile that defines them.

The subject of the first stanza is of course musical, which might account for the extreme complexity of the patterning. But some of the same devices are present in the second stanza:

1. 5 links subject with image: είμαστε/απίστευτες

1. 6 links parts of the imagery: σα δάχτυλα στα χάη

11. 5 and 7 have semantic linking: απίστευτες αντένες/άπειρο αντηχάει

11. 5 and 7-8 have grammatical reinforcement and semantic contrast. The antennae are linked to their aspiration and at the same time to their fall: απίστευτες, άπειρο. πέσουνε, σπασμένες.

Note that in the tercets, where the theme is entirely one of disunity, sound patterning, beyond that imposed by rhythm, largely disappears, though in 1. 9 *we* is connected to the image again through σ and τ patterns:

είμαστε κάτι διάχυτες αισθήσεις.

In the light of this proliferation of non-ironic musical effects in Karyotakis's poems, we should at the very least have to read the use of musical patterns in 'Ιδανικοί αυτόχειρες' as self-ironising.

V) Let us now look at what is ostensibly a completely different sort of poem, 'Ιασή τάφος', by Cavafy [See Appendix, G].

If we look at this poem from a musical point of view, the first things to strike us are likely to be the thematic rhymes:

(a) πόλεως/επιπόλαιος city = frivolity

(b) Διαβάτη/υπερτάτη = the assumption that the passerby identifies himself with the value scale of the poem.

The second musical point to strike us will be the identification of the boy with beauty, through the vowel patterns at the beginning of 1. 1 and the end of 1. 2:

Κείμαι ο Ιασής

me o ya

εμορφιά

*em o ya.*⁶

We can then look at the effects of other sound patterns. In the first stanza two noun groups are emphasised:

(a) φ ο έφηβος ο φημισμένος για εμορφιά
μ

(b) π κ' επίσης ο επιπόλαιος/ο απλούς λαός
λ

and one verb group:

(c) μ
β Μ' εθαύμασαν βαθείς
θ

The verb group is linked back to the first noun group (remembering that β is voiced φ):

β: έφηβος, εθαύμασαν, βαθείς

φ: ο έφηβος ο φημισμένος, για εμορφιά, σοφοί

μ: φημισμένος, εμορφιά, εθαύμασαν.

The effect of these connections is that the significant image of Iases — his youth and beauty — is linked phonetically with his

6. There are other instances of Cavafy's treatment of initial ia- as *ya* rather than *ia*, e.g. Ιανναίος and Ιούδας in 'Αλέξανδρος Ιανναίος, και Αλεξάνδρα', Ιησούς in 'Ιερέυς του Σεραπίου', and ιεροτάτης in the same poem.

admirers and their admiration. He is his image, his existence is defined by his effect.

In a comparable way, in the second stanza, there is a musical link between society, the role it attributes to Iases, and the effect it has upon him. The connecting phonemes are μ , κ/χ , ρ and σ :

. . . να μ' έχει ο κόσμος Νάρκισσο κ' Ερμή,
 η καταχρήσεις μ' έφθειραν, μ' εσκότωσαν.

Note that $\kappa/\sigma/\tau$ in this last line link καταχρήσεις = abuses with εσκότωσαν = destruction. In lines 7-8 δεν θα επικρίνεις (κ/ρ) uses the phonetic link to emphasise rejection of moral judgment: abuse $\rightarrow$ destruction $\rightarrow$ *not* moral judgment, while Αλεξανδρεύς/ξέρεις (εξ/ξε) stresses the complementary connection, Alexandrian = sharing the same code. The paradox is emphasised by a positional parallel: μ' έφθειραν/τι/θήρμην. The positive and negative poles of Alexandrian life, with four musical elements in common, stand in comparable rhythmic position in the two (rhyming) lines.

This is a poem in which the rhythmic and metrical patterns are dramatic. There are major rhythmic breaks in all lines except 1. 2. Through the accompanying sound patterning Cavafy establishes relationships between the characters, actions and values staged in the poem. He also uses the sound patterns to provide a unity to counteract the fragmentation created by the dramatic rhythms he uses. Notice how varied the sound play is compared with much of what we have seen so far. There is a main sequence of related consonants ($\phi/\beta/\pi$) with other groups playing independent linking roles (e.g. μ/θ). There are no initial alliterative patterns, but consonant + vowel patterns and sequences, and their inversions, are introduced, as are thematic rhymes. The music has clear semantic functions.

*

In conclusion, it seems fair to say that it is clearly not enough to distinguish loosely between musical and non-musical poetry in the early decades of the century. There are all sorts of possible determining factors, such as the relationship between sound-

patterning and predictability of theme, and the relationship between sound-patterning and metre/rhythm.

The issues to consider include, in particular, the extent to which simple alliteration is predominant — the extent to which we are dealing with one or two repeated phonemes over a stretch of verse as opposed to a complex network of sounds and sound groups. On the evidence of the handful of material which I have examined, we can see a spectrum, running from the predictability of sound-patterning and its relationship to conventional form and predictable content in Chatzopoulos, to the very subtle and unpredictable use made of it by Cavafy to shape his material. The subject merits broader study. But let us at least have no more of this distinction between poetry for the ear and poetry for the eye as far as the musical element of Greek poetry 1900-1930 is concerned. It is all aural — if by no means all oral.

Christ Church, Oxford

Appendix

A. ΦΘΙΝΟΠΩΡΟ

Άσε το φθινόπωρο
γύρω σου να στρώση
τ' άνθη τα στερνά·
μια ζωή πεθαίνει
μια πνοή περνά —
τάχα σε προσμένει
μια άνοιξη ξανά;
Άσε το φθινόπωρο
γύρω σου ν' απλώση
μια στερνή ευωδιά·
μια φωνή σωπαίνει,
μια χαρά χαμένη
μέσα στην καρδιά —
τα στερνά τα φύλλα
παίρνει το φθινόπωρο
γύρω απ' τα κλαδιά.

K. CHATZOPOULOS, *Bradinoi Thryloi*

- B. Και ήρθα βοσκοπούλα στα βουνά,
και ήρθα βλαχοπούλα στα καλύβια·
χτύπησε καρδιά και στα λιθάρια,
σάλεψαν φτερά και στα μολύβια.

Κ' ένωσαν και οι λόγγοι κάποιον νου,
και κατέβη η χάρη ως το σκουλήκι
και μαλάκωσε ρυθμός και το σκοπό
που σκορπούν ουρλιάζοντας οι λύκοι.

Και ηύρα κ' έζησα σε κάποια
κρυσταλλένια απέραντα παλάτια,
μέσα στον παιδιών τα ολάνοιχτα
γλυκοξαφνιασμένα μάτια.

Και με κύκλωσαν βασιλικά
σα χερουβικά πνεύματα πλήθια,
γύρω στις σπιθόβολες γωνίες,
τα θησαυροφόρα Παραμύθια,

κι όπου διάβηκα έπλεξαν για με
τ' άγρια και τ' αμάραντα λουλούδια
και τρανά με διαλαλήσαν των βουνών
τα νεραϊδογέννητα Τραγούδια.

K. PALAMAS, *Tragoudia tes Heliogennetes* 5

- C. Τ' αζεδιάλυτα σκοτάδια
τα χαράζει μια λιγνή λευκότη
νυχτοφέρνοντας και αυτή·
και είτανε του νου μου η πρώτη
χαρ αυγή.

Και είταν ώρα μελιχρότατη·
και είτανε χυμένο ολόγουρα
κάτι πιο χαϊδευτικό
κι από τ' αεράκι,
όταν έρχεται γιομάτο από τα μπάλασμα
πρωϊνά των ολοπράσινων πευκώνων,
κι από τ' αεράκι·
και είταν πέρα κάπου σε μια γη,
σε πηγή λαών και χρόνων·
και είτανε στη Θράκη.

K. PALAMAS, *Dodekalogos*, Logos A, 1-15

D.

ΙΔΑΝΙΚΟΙ ΑΥΤΟΧΕΙΡΕΣ

Γυρίζουν το κλειδί στην πόρτα, παίρνουν
τα παλιά, φυλαγμένα γράμματά τους,
διαβάζουν ήσυχα, κι έπειτα σέρνουν
για τελευταία φορά τα βήματά τους.

Ήταν η ζωή τους, λένε, τραγωδία.
Θεέ μου, το φριχτό γέλιο των ανθρώπων,
τα δάκρυα, ο ιδρώς, η νοσταλγία
των ουρανών, η ερημία των τόπων.

Στέκονται στο παράθυρο, κοιτάνε
τα δέντρα, τα παιδιά, πέρα τη φύση,
τους μαρμαράδες που σφυροκοπάνε,
τον ήλιο που για πάντα θέλει δύσει.

Όλα τελείωσαν. Το σημείωμα νά το,
σύντομο, απλό, βαθύ. καθώς ταιριάζει,
αδιαφορία, συγχώρηση γεμάτο
για κείνον που θα κλαίει και θα διαβάζει.

Βλέπουν τον καθρέφτη, βλέπουν την ώρα,
ρωτούν αν είναι τρέλα τάχα ή λάθος,
«όλα τελείωσαν» ψιθυρίζουν «τώρα»,
πως θ' αναβάλουν βέβαιοι κατά βάθος.

K. KARYOTAKIS, *Satires*

- E. Δέντρα μου, δέντρα ξέφυλλα στη νύχτα του Δεκέβρη,
στη σκοτεινή, βαθιά δεντροστοιχία,
μαζί πηγαίνουμε, μαζί και η μέρα θα μας έβρει,
ω ερημικά, θλιμμένα μου στοιχεία.

Αύριο, μεθαύριο, σύντροφο θα μ' έχετε και φίλο,
τα μυστικά σας θέλω να μου πείτε,
μα όταν, αργότερα, φανεί το πρώτο νέο σας φύλλο,
θα πάω μακριά, το φως για να χαρείτε.

Κι αφού ταιριάζει, ω δέντρα μου, να μένω απ' όλα πίσω
τα θαλερά και τα εύθυμα στην πλάση,
εγώ λιγότερο γι' αυτό δε θα σας αγαπήσω,
όταν θα μ' έχετε κι εσείς ακόμη προσπεράσει.

K. KARYOTAKIS, *Elegeia*

- F. Είμαστε κάτι ξεχαρβαλωμένες
κιθάρες. Ο άνεμος, όταν περνάει,
στίχους, ήχους παράφωνους ξυπνάει
στις χορδές που κρέμονται σαν καδένες.

Είμαστε κάτι απίστευτες αντένες.
Υψώνονται σα δάχτυλα στα χάη,
στην κορυφή τους τ' άπειρο αντηχάει,
μα γρήγορα θα πέσουνε σπασμένες.

Είμαστε κάτι διάχυτες αισθήσεις,
χωρίς ελπίδα να συγκεντρωθούμε.
Στα νεύρα μας μπερδεύεται όλη η φύσις.

Στο σώμα, στην ενθύμηση πονούμε.
Μας διώχνουνε τα πράγματα, κι η ποίησις
είναι το καταφύγιο που φθονούμε.

K. KARYOTAKIS, *Elegeia*

- G. ΙΑΣΗ ΤΑΦΟΣ

Κείμαι ο Ιασής ενταύθα. Της μεγάλης ταύτης πόλεως
ο έφηβος ο φημισμένος για εμορφιά.
Μ' εθαύμασαν βαθείς σοφοί· κ' επίσης ο επιπόλαιος,
ο απλούς λαός. Και χαίρομουν ίσα και για

τα δυο. Μα απ' το πολύ να μ' έχει ο κόσμος Νάρκισσο κ' Ερμή,
η καταχρήσεις μ' έφθειραν, μ' εσκοτώσαν. Διαβάτη,
αν είσαι Αλεξανδρεύς, δεν θα επικρίνεις. Ξέρεις την ορμή
του βίου μας· τι θερμήν έχει· τι ηδονή υπερτάτη.

C.P. CAVAFY

Orality and the reception of late Byzantine vernacular literature

RODERICK BEATON

The starting point for this paper is the belief that orality has to be understood in a wider sense than is given to the term by the oral-formulaic theory of Milman Parry and Albert Lord. This is the more important when the field of study is medieval or modern Greece, societies far removed from what Walter Ong (1982: 31-75) has termed the 'primary orality' of a culture from which writing is absent. The oral formulaic theory, although excellent as a tool for the analysis of materials actually transcribed from oral performance, has come to be seen in the last fifteen years or so as an unwieldy and often unreliable yardstick for assessing the interaction of oral and written types of discourse. The insistence of the theory that for a text to be considered oral, the three processes of composition, performance and transmission should be simultaneous, imposes a definition of orality which is unjustifiably restrictive, and despite the well-intentioned efforts of Albert Lord and others to address the problem of the 'transitional' text,¹ the method of analysis developed through close study of one particular oral tradition in Yugoslavia has proved disappointingly inflexible in its attempt to account for texts which are neither, according to its own definitions, truly oral nor fully literary (cf. Beaton 1987).

The texts to be discussed in this paper are narrative poems, written between the twelfth century and the fifteenth, whose language approximates in varying degrees to modern Greek and therefore, it may reasonably be assumed, to the spoken language of the period. They begin with the epic or romance *Digenes Akrites*, probably of the early twelfth century, and include the romances and satirical fables, the pseudo-history of Belisarios

1. See for example Lord 1986 and the discussion in Foley 1988: 106-8.

and two verse chronicles, (the *Chronicle of the Morea* and the *Chronicle of the Tocco family*), all written between the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries.

For the purposes of this paper I shall not be considering the vernacular court poems of the twelfth century addressed directly to specific patrons, nor the didactic poem known as 'Spaneas', the date of whose earliest vernacular version remains uncertain.²

All of these of course exist only in the form of written texts. Any consideration of possible oral factors in their genesis or subsequent transmission must therefore take account of the transfer from an oral to a written medium or vice versa. In order to do this it would be necessary, in the terms used by Parry and Lord, to consider separately their composition, performance and transmission. The last two of these can be considered as, in literary terms, aspects of reception; and this, I believe, is an important area which has not been sufficiently studied.

Composition

The case has been made by Michael and Elizabeth Jeffreys that many, at least, of these texts are the work of poets who consciously followed the techniques of oral composition as it was practised at that time, and that their language and style therefore reflect the formulaic style and mixed register of an oral tradition now otherwise lost.³ Even before the Jeffreys, Constantine Trypanis (1963) had gone still further to assert that the divergent manuscript versions that we possess of some of these texts are the product of direct transcription of an oral composition; and this argument has been revived with greater detail by Ole Smith (1987; 1988) with regard to a single text, the *Achilleid*.

The case for a direct relation to oral traditional poetry is only really persuasive in one case, *Digenes Akrites*, which is generally agreed to derive in part from the heroic oral poetry of the Byzantine eastern frontier. Stylistic features of the variant texts of this

2. On the nature and source of this text see Danezis 1987a; 1987b.

3. The most important of the series of articles in which the Jeffreys make their case are collected in Jeffreys, E. and M. 1983.

poem, and especially the Escorial version,⁴ which most closely approximates to the vernacular, can plausibly be attributed to the poem's oral sources, and are also strikingly echoed in modern Greek oral song. This oral substratum of *Digenes Akrites*, which has long been recognised, has recently been investigated in a systematic and sophisticated manner by Ioannis Prombonas (1985), who has catalogued verbal and stylistic parallels between the Escorial version and modern songs, especially of the Pontos region, and by Bernard Fenik (1991) who persuasively identifies elements of the oral style of modern Greek folk song in the making in the E version of *Digenes*.

The demonstrable dependence of *Digenes Akrites* on an oral tradition which bears recognisable hallmarks of *modern* oral song, considerably weakens the link with oral tradition of all the other vernacular texts up to the fifteenth century. With the exception of the brief 'Song of Armoures',⁵ which is widely accepted as a transcription of a heroic oral song of the type that influenced the composition of *Digenes*, no other literary text of the late Byzantine period reveals as strong a dependence, either stylistically or thematically, on the kind of oral tradition of which we have evidence today. Conversely, the proof afforded by the 'Song of Armoures' and the E version of *Digenes Akrites*, that an oral tradition recognisable as the ancestor of the modern tradition of oral song did exist in the twelfth century, makes it less likely that a different oral tradition, characterised by different formulae, stylistic devices and themes, could have influenced the romances, satires and vernacular chronicles of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as the Jeffreys have argued.

It is nonetheless certain that the authors of all of these texts were aware of the earlier stages of the modern oral tradition. Combing of the romances, in particular, reveals a smattering of formulae borrowed from that tradition, which are not however used functionally as formulae; while the many repetitions noted

4. Edited by Stylianos Alexiou (1985).

5. A newly edited version of the text, based on the two extant MSS of the fifteenth century, is included in Alexiou 1985, together with introduction, notes, glossary and bibliography on the poem.

by the Jeffreys in systematic analyses of the *Chronicle of the Morea* and the *War of Troy* have hardly any currency in the modern oral tradition. These repeated phrases reveal a familiarity with and respect for the manner of oral composition, but it is far more likely that the phrases themselves, many of which contain learned linguistic elements, were traditional within a written rather than an oral medium.⁶

It may be concluded that direct dependence on orally composed material is found only in the 'Song of Armoures', which may be regarded as a fairly close transcription, and in *Digenes Akrites*, which in all its versions can be seen as a literary adaptation of originally oral source material.⁷ No other text is based either thematically or stylistically on an oral source for which any independent evidence survives, although most vernacular texts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries betray a knowledge of an oral traditional style of the same type as had influenced *Digenes* and as still exists today.

Performance

The term 'performance' literally refers of course to an oral event. Its non-oral equivalent, which will also be considered under this heading, is the act of reading. Not surprisingly we have no independent accounts of the audience or readership for which these texts were first written. Our only evidence is internal to the texts themselves. This evidence is of two kinds; comments by the author/narrator directed at the addressee of the narrative, and indications of the kind of public to which the text is apparently addressed.

The first of these, direct address, presents a confusing picture, which can be well illustrated by the Escorial version of *Digenes Akrites*. At one point the author/narrator addresses οἱ ἄρχοντες, a locution which can be matched in oral songs, especially from Crete, recorded in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The implication is surely of oral delivery, but a warning must im-

6. For a critique of the Jeffreys' theory as applied to the romances see Beaton 1989: 160-83.

7. For a new view of the status of the E version and its relation to its oral sources see Ricks 1989; 1990.

mediately be sounded. The fifteenth-century copyist of the manuscript which contains this version reveals himself by various intrusions of dialect as a Cretan (Alexiou 1985: viii; xvii); the possibility cannot be excluded that this 'folksong' touch, found only once in the text, belongs with these fifteenth-century intrusions by the copyist. Elsewhere in the same text we find the following:

Και ὅσοι βασανίζεσθε δι' ἀγάπην κορασίου,
ακούσατε διά γραφῆς των (θαυμαστών) Ελλήνων
πόσα και αυτοί υπομείνασιν βάσανα διά τον πόθον.
Βλέπετε, οι αναγινώσκοντες, τους αριστείς εκείνους. . .

Digenes Akrites E 709-12

It is scarcely credible that these lines were intended primarily for oral delivery. On the other hand the reference to *hearing* the written deeds of the ancient Hellenes, and the unusual address to the poem's readers in the plural, are indications that reading aloud to an audience was a familiar phenomenon in the circles to which this text was addressed.

A similar picture emerges from such instances of direct address as are found in the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century texts as a whole. The romances of that period contain a number of direct addresses to both readers and hearers, in both singular and plural (Beaton 1989: 184-6). In addition the pseudo-historical *Ιστορία του Βελισσαρίου*, in two out of four principal redactions, addresses its reader or listener as *παιδί μου* or *υιέ μου* (Bakker and van Gemert 1988: § 76); while the *Chronicle of the Morea*, considered as linguistically one of the closest of all these texts to the vernacular of the early fourteenth century, is again specifically addressed to a single listener (ed. Schmitt 1904: lines 1-3). The same is true of the *Tale of the Four-Footed Beasts* which unusually among these texts can be dated fairly exactly — to 1364 or very shortly after (Tsiouni 1972: line 10a). The most that can be concluded from this evidence is that silent reading and public performance seem equally to have been envisaged by the writers and/or the copyists of texts of this kind.

None of the twelfth- or early fourteenth-century texts gives any direct clue as to the kind of audience or readership that their writers envisaged, although indirect evidence suggests that most

if not all were addressed to an aristocratic and more often than not also educated public (see Beaton 1989: 186-9). From the latter part of the fourteenth century onwards, however, we find writers explicitly addressing a public of a rather different sort. The *Tale of the Four-Footed Beasts* begins:

Διήγησις παιδιόφραστος περί των τετραπόδων,
 ίνα αναγινώσκωνται και χρώνται ταύτα παίδες,
 οι φοιτηταί και νεαροί διά την ευνοστίαν·
 γέγραπται γαρ εις ένωσιν μαθήσεως και πόθου.

Tale of the Four-Footed Beasts 1-4

It has been questioned whether this subtle, but far from genteel, allegory could really have been intended for the very young. But the claim of a vernacular text to an educative role is taken up frequently after this. The *Ιστορία του Βελισαρίου*, in two versions, also claims that its purpose is to transpose the fruits of the author's learning into an idiom suitable for the instruction of ordinary people (Bakker and van Gemert 1988: § 75), and the same formula crops up again almost unaltered in the fifteenth-century *Διήγησις γεναμένη εν Τροία* (Nørgaard and Smith 1975: lines 886-8; 1062-3) and in a late interpolation into the *Achilleid* (ed. Hesseling 1919: Version N, lines 1798-1811).

If the audiences or readers of the earlier vernacular texts were probably aristocratic and cultivated, from the second half of the fourteenth century onwards there begins to emerge a humbler market for literature of entertainment in the vernacular. The Naples manuscript (early sixteenth century) of the *Achilleid* addresses a listening public directly and declares that its purpose is moral education:

Αλλ' όσοι και αναισθάνεσθε⁸ τον πόθον των Ερώτων,
 όσοι αν ουκ εδέξασθε τρώσιν ποσώς αγάπης,
 άπαντες νυν ακούσατε αφήγησιν την ταύτην, . . .
 να μάθετε δε άπαντες, να πληροφορηθήτε,
 το πώς ο πόθος δύναται και πόσα καταφλέγει, . . .
 και να μην αλαζονεύεσθε προς την φρικτήν του τόλμην, . . .
 ότι φρικτός και θαυμαστός και μέγας ρήγας είναι.

Achilleid N 9-11, 13-14, 17, 19

8. Sic in Hesseling 1919. Corrected to αν αισθάνεσθε by Xanthoudidis (see Kriaras 1968-: ad. loc.).

Here we are surely in the world of a singer who has to attract an audience before he can start, and remote from the aristocratic circles for which the text was almost certainly originally written. The same holds good in all probability also for the prologue in the similarly late unique manuscript of *Velthandros and Chrysantza* (Kriaras 1955: lines 1-4). These manuscripts represent the earliest evidence we have of oral presentation before a specifically *popular* audience.

Transmission

Already in discussing the nature of the audience addressed in later manuscripts of romance texts we have begun to move from the original circumstances of performance envisaged by the writers of these texts, to their subsequent reception or, in the vocabulary of oral-traditional studies, their transmission. The possibility that some of the texts as they have come down to us in manuscript form had before that been subject to oral transmission has been canvassed several times, and most persuasively for a text which was produced in a rather different cultural milieu from those that we have been discussing so far: the satirical poems of the late fourteenth century written by the Cretan poet Stefanos Sachlikis. In these texts, for the first time in medieval Greek literature, elements of an identifiable regional dialect are introduced into the literary vernacular of the period. A full assessment of the evidence for oral transmission in this case must await the appearance of a new edition announced by Nikos Panayotakis (1987); but if at least one of these manuscripts can be proved to be the product of oral transmission, then an important principle will have been established which could be applied to other vernacular texts as well. (The case of Sachlikis further reinforces the principled separation of the processes of composition, performance and transmission; since there is no question of these poems having been orally *composed*).

Divergences among manuscript witnesses, comparable to those among the manuscripts of Sachlikis, are found for all the vernacular texts of the period which are preserved in more than one manuscript. A strong case has been mounted by Hans Eideneier that in cases of multiple variants each manuscript represents a

separate recording of an oral performance. Some of the texts transmitted in this way he sees as also having been composed orally, but in the case of the *Πτωχοπροδρομικά* he has proposed instead the elaboration and insertion of orally-created material into a text which originated at court and, he believes, in the learned language. According to Eideneier, the proliferation of manuscript copying in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries represents an attempt to capture a dying oral tradition in writing during the period when the last vestiges of Byzantine popular culture were rapidly disappearing (Eideneier 1982-3).

This argument hinges upon the possibility of attributing certain types of manuscript variation to *mishearings* rather than to misreadings (cf. Eideneier 1985). Against it other evidence suggests that the roles of author and copyist were not fully distinguished when texts were being written in the vernacular. Copyists could be authors in a small way and were not abashed to improve on what they saw before them; and in this way the *sinnvolle Varianten* which Eideneier accounts for by invoking oral processes are explicable without reference to oral transmission.⁹

One text which for long was thought to be the product of oral transmission is the Escorial version of *Digenes*; but the meticulous work done on that text in the last ten years by Stylianos Alexiou has now effectively ruled out this possibility (Alexiou 1979: 35-43; 1985: 1xxiii-1xxvii). And if such a prime candidate for oral transmission can be proved to be the product of a solely scribal tradition, it will become more difficult to sustain a claim to oral transmission in other instances.

On the other hand, once we accept that oral *performance* of narrative texts was a normal practice during the period under discussion, we must also admit the possibility that some of the manuscript witnesses we possess could have been produced by members of the audience on such an occasion, who had never seen the written text. After all, several of Shakespeare's plays were transmitted in this way. There is also limited evidence from a later period for oral transmission of literary texts of the Cretan Renaissance, as well as of popular narratives in rhymed verse in

9. See Beaton 1989: 178-90.

Crete and Cyprus. It must be said, however, that examples from the eighteenth century onwards suggest that it would be most unlikely for a narrative of any length to remain in oral circulation for long without the parallel circulation of written texts (cf. Beaton 1987).

Conclusion

A provisional overall picture of the role of orality in Greek vernacular literature between the twelfth and the fifteenth centuries now begins to emerge. Firstly, oral precedents play a part, in varying degrees, in the composition of the texts; but only the 'The song of Armoures' can be regarded as the product of oral composition, and only *Digenes* is based substantially on an oral source. Secondly, oral performance of written texts of this type was common, but the many references to readers and to the works themselves as texts clearly imply that this took the form of reading aloud rather than a memorised or improvised performance. Silent reading seems also to have been a recognised practice for literature in the vernacular. It is not until the mid fourteenth century that vernacular texts come to be addressed to a less educated public; and only in manuscript interpolations of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries is there any evidence that such texts were orally presented to a popular audience. Finally, oral transmission does not have to be invoked to account for variants in the manuscript tradition of these texts, and in some cases can be ruled out or relegated to a very minor role. But one case can very probably be substantiated — the manuscripts of Sachlikis — and further examination of individual manuscripts, such as is currently being undertaken by Hans Eideneier, may reveal others.¹⁰

What is almost certain is that further study of the historical and theoretical relationship between orality and literary texts will do much to increase our understanding of the earliest literature in Modern Greek.

King's College, London

10. Eideneier's principles are employed in practice in his edition of the 'Krasopateras' (1988); and he has also announced a new edition of the *Ptochoprodromika* which will include a major reassessment of the MS tradition of these poems (1987).

References

- Alexiou, S. 1979. *Ακριτικά — το πρόβλημα της εγκυρότητας του κειμένου Ε — χρονολόγηση — αποκατάσταση χωρίων — ερμηνευτικά* (Iraklio).
- Alexiou, S. 1985. *Βασίλειος Διγενής Ακρίτης (κατά το χειρόγραφο του Εσκοριάλ) και το όσμα του Αρμούρη* (Athens).
- Bakker, W. and van Gemert, A. 1988. *Ιστορία του Βελισαρίου. Κριτική έκδοση των τεσσάρων διασκευών με εισαγωγή, σχόλια και γλωσσάριο*. [Βυζαντινή και Νεοελληνική Βιβλιοθήκη 6] (Athens).
- Beaton, R. 1987. 'Modern ποιητάρηδες and medieval poetry in vernacular Greek'. *Πρακτικά Β' Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου, Τόμ.Γ': Νεώτερον Τμήμα* (Nicosia) 485-94.
- Beaton, R. 1989. *The Medieval Greek Romance* (Cambridge).
- Danezis, G. 1987a. 'Das Vorbild des Spaneas: ein neuer Vorschlag und die Folgen für die Edition des Textes', in H. Eideneier (ed.), *Neograeca Medii Aevi: Text und Ausgabe. Akten zum Symposium Köln 1986* (Cologne) 89-102.
- Danezis, G. 1987b. *Spaneas: Vorlage, Quellen, Versionen* [Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia 31] (Munich).
- Eideneier, H. 1982-3. 'Leser- oder Hörerkreis? Zur byzantinischen Dichtung in der Volkssprache', *Ελληνικά* 34: 119-50.
- Eideneier, H. 1985. 'Sinnvolles Verhör im Ptochoprodromos III', *Ελληνικά* 36: 78-101.
- Eideneier, H. 1987. 'Der Ptochoprodromos in schriftlicher und mündlicher Überlieferung', in H. Eideneier (ed.), *Neograeca Medii Aevi: Text und Ausgabe. Akten zum Symposium Köln 1986* (Cologne) 101-119.
- Eideneier, H. 1988. *Krasopateras: Kritische Ausgabe der Versionen des 16. - 18. Jahrhunderts* [Neograeca Medii Aevi 3] (Cologne).
- Fenik, B. 1991. *Basileios Digenis Akritis: Epic and Popular Style in the Escorial Version* (Iraklio).
- Foley, J.M. 1988. *The Theory of Oral Composition: History and Methodology* (Bloomington and Indianapolis).
- Hesseling, D.C. 1919. *L'Achilléide byzantine, avec une introduction, des observations et un index* (Amsterdam).
- Jeffreys, E. and M. 1983. *Popular Literature in Late Byzantium* (London).
- Κριαράς, Ε. 1955. *Βυζαντινά ιπποτικά μυθιστορήματα* [Βασική Βιβλιοθήκη 2] (Athens).
- Κριαράς, Ε. 1968-. *Λεξικό μεσαιωνικής δημώδους γραμματείας, 1100-1669* (Thessaloniki).
- Lord, A.B. 1986. 'The merging of two worlds: oral and written poetry as carriers of ancient values', in J.M. Foley (ed.), *Oral tradition in literature: interpretation in context* (Columbia, Missouri) 19-64.
- Norgaard, L. and Smith, O. 1975. *A Byzantine Iliad: The Text of Par. Suppl. Gr. 926. Edited with Critical Apparatus, Introduction and Indexes* [Opuscula Graecolatina 5] (Copenhagen).
- Ong, W. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: the Technologizing of the Word* (London and New York).
- Panajotakis, N. 1987. 'Sachlikisstudien', in H. Eideneier (ed.), *Neograeca Medii Aevi: Text und Ausgabe. Akten zum Symposium Köln 1986* (Cologne) 219-78.
- Prombonas, I. 1985. *Ακριτικά Α'* (Athens).
- Ricks, D. 1989. 'Is the Escorial Akrites a unitary poem?' *B* 30: 184-207.
- Ricks, D. 1990. *Byzantine Heroic Poetry* (Bristol).

RODERICK BEATON

- Schmitt, J. 1904. *The Chronicle of Morea* (London; reprinted Groningen, 1967).
- Smith, O. 1987. 'Versions and manuscripts of the Achilleid', in H. Eideneier (ed.), *Neograeca Medii Aevi: Text und Ausgabe. Akten zum Symposion Köln 1986* (Cologne) 315-25.
- Smith, O. 1988. 'Notes on the Byzantine Achilleid: the Oxford version', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 39: 259-72.
- Trypanis, C. 1963. 'Byzantine oral poetry', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 56: 1-3.
- Tsiouni, V. 1972. *Παιδιόφραστος Διήγησις των Ζώων των Τετραπόδων: critical edition*. [Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia 15] (Munich).

Orality in Cretan Narrative Poetry

DAVID HOLTON

The island of Crete, during the period of Venetian rule, developed a poetic tradition unparalleled anywhere else in the Greek-speaking world. In this paper we shall be concerned only with poetry in the vernacular, whether in a systematically cultivated form of the local dialect, or in a more universal kind of Greek which at times also admitted learned or ecclesiastical words or grammatical forms; verse written wholly in archaic Greek which would have been unintelligible to the uneducated is outside the scope of this paper.¹ Necessarily we are dealing with written texts, both manuscript and printed. The evidence for such a tradition begins in or around the 1370s with the poems of Stefanos Sachlikis (the manuscripts are of later date): satire, verse autobiography and didactic poetry are the principal genres.² The tradition continues until the capture of the island by the Turks, completed in 1669. The corpus of Cretan poetic texts is not large but it embraces a variety of genres, including religious, consolatory, erotic and narrative verse, and it includes a number of works of high poetic merit. From the 1580s drama is added to the genres cultivated

1. Few substantive changes have been made to the paper presented to the SCOMGIU Colloquium on 'Orality in Medieval and Modern Greek poetry'; bibliographical references have been kept to a minimum, with the aim of indicating relevant source materials and some further reading, rather than full documentation of the arguments advanced here. In any event the remarks made in this paper should be seen as suggestive, and certainly not conclusive. The subject of orality in Cretan poetry still awaits detailed investigation. Morgan 1960 remains a useful starting-point, although now superseded on many matters of dating. An illuminating approach to the question of the interaction of oral and literary elements in Cretan poetry will be found in a chapter by Margaret Alexiou to be published in a volume edited by the present writer (forthcoming).

2. For the latest researches on Sachlikis, see Panajotakis 1987a (expanded Greek version Panajiotakis 1987b), where full bibliography will be found. On Sachlikis's life and literary models see van Gemert 1980. Professor Panajiotakis is preparing a new edition of the poems.

and the period from then until 1669 marks the 'zenith of Renaissance literature in Greece' (L. Politis 1973:52).

I propose to limit myself to three texts composed in the sixteenth century,³ for two reasons: firstly, this century marked the transition from script to print, without the latter necessarily supplanting the former; in 1509 the first vernacular Greek work was printed in Venice — the *Apokopos* of Bergadis.⁴ By the end of the sixteenth century at least twenty vernacular poetic works had been printed, some of them already several times.⁵ Many of these texts have a Cretan provenance, including the *Apokopos*. Secondly, although little new datable Cretan poetry appears to have been composed in the first half of the sixteenth century, the second half and, more particularly, the last two or three decades, sees Cretan poetry coming to its 'maturity', in the conventionally adopted term. It would not be an exaggeration to say that between 1500 and 1600 Cretan literature makes a belated leap from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance (cf. S. Alexiou 1985a: 15-16).

Can these developments be fruitfully examined in terms of orality and literacy? Narrative genres would appear to offer the best chance of a useful answer to the question since story-telling is an activity shared by all cultures across the oral-chirographic-typographic spectrum. Drama, narratorless, would not serve our purpose so well: its 'orality' is a different matter.

In the 1950s a debate was initiated among Greek literary scholars on the question: 'Does Cretan Renaissance literature have a learned or popular character?' The view that has prevailed is that of Stylianos Alexiou: the Cretan literary texts of the

3. Some uncertainty remains about the dating of two of the works selected (see below), but it is not unreasonable to regard both as sixteenth-century productions.

4. An exemplar of the first edition, previously thought to date from 1519, has only recently come to light: see Layton (forthcoming). For a facsimile of the second edition (1534) see Kechaglogiou 1982, with a useful introduction. The most recent critical edition of the *Apokopos* is that of S. Alexiou (1963 and 1971).

5. For a check-list see L. Politis 1977: 480-2, to which some further editions should now be added.

Renaissance period (that is, roughly, from 1570 to 1669) are 'the products of a developed urban society', deeply influenced by the intellectual currents of the Italian Renaissance (S. Alexiou 1985a: 9). Their language and versification are artful, very different from the style of folk song. Alexiou does not deny that the Cretan texts drew on the oral tradition, but the differences between folk poetry and the style of Kornaros, Chortatsis and Foskolos are for him more significant than any similarities (ibid. 21-3). Those texts written before the mid-sixteenth century, in which Italian influence is less marked or non-existent, must be seen as medieval, Byzantine hangovers, preoccupied with death and moral salvation; some contain 'popular' themes such as that of exile (ξενιτιά), others offer evidence of 'a slow familiarisation with the new poetic manners which had appeared in the west' (ibid. 16). From the middle of the sixteenth century the influence of the Renaissance becomes more perceptible: we may observe 'a raising of the hitherto popular (λαϊκό) level of vernacular (δημώδης) literary production' (ibid. 17). We are offered a view of Cretan literature which divides it into two sharply differentiated periods, stressing medieval vs. Renaissance characteristics, unsophisticated vs. learned, unsystematic vs. subtle.

We might therefore consider whether the concept of orality, however we define it, could offer an alternative literary-historical explanation for the development taking place in Cretan poetry between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries. Caution is needed, above all because *primary* orality is not involved in the Greek case: the lengthy chirographic tradition and the importance attached to education and literacy mean that writing was a familiar part of the everyday experience of even the illiterate.⁶ Our Cretan texts are neither orally composed nor orally transmitted in the strict sense. At the most we can expect to find 'influence' of orality, an oral residue (cf. Ong 1982:105), or at least signs of an awareness of orality (whether of composition or performance).

6. In other words we have to do with a 'para-literate' society, to borrow an apt term suggested by Peter Mackridge in the course of the Colloquium.

It is perhaps not without relevance that some of these works subsequently underwent oral transmission. We might consider the implications of the fact that the anonymous sixteenth-century pastoral idyll *Η Βοσκοπούλα* (*The Shepherdess*) subsequently gave rise to a number of oral variants,⁷ or that the *Erotokritos* was widely sung and memorised in Crete and elsewhere,⁸ or that the tragedy *Erofili* passed into a kind of popular theatrical performance in various parts of Greece.⁹ Does this phenomenon indicate that the texts themselves possessed a latent propensity for oralisation? Given the different metrical, generic, linguistic and stylistic characteristics of the three works just mentioned, there is no obvious common denominator which might make them amenable to oral transmission.

Despite the fascinating possibilities which such an enquiry might open up, the present investigation will limit itself to examining a small selection of narrative poems of the sixteenth century for signs of orality in the texts themselves. The texts to be discussed are the following:

1) The *Συμφορά της Κρήτης*, by Manolis Sklavos, is a narrative poem relating the earthquake which destroyed most of Kastro in May 1508 and offering moral lessons to be drawn from the event. The text is known from a single manuscript, Vindob. theol. gr. 244, which was probably written between 1516 and 1520; the poem was apparently composed in the year of the earthquake (cf. v. 150).¹⁰

2) The *Chapbook of the Donkey* (*Γαδάρου, Λύκου και Αλουπούς Διήγησις ωραία*) is a kind of Aesopian fable telling how the Donkey outwitted the Fox and the Wolf, with elements of social and religious satire and a good deal of scatological humour. Like the other two texts it is in couplet-rhymed fifteen-syllable verses,

7. For a discussion of such orally transmitted versions of literary works see A. Politis 1982: 276ff.

8. Alexiou expresses reservations about how much of the *Erotokritos* was actually memorised (1985b: λζ').

9. The most recent edition of the tragedy is that of Alexiou and Aposkiti 1988. For the transmission of extracts of the play in oral tradition see Puchner 1983.

10. Edited by Bouboulidis 1955; a new edition is needed. For a discussion of the dating of the Vienna manuscript see most recently Tsavari 1987: 47-8.

but it is related to an earlier unrhymed version of the tale (*Synaxarion*), a variant text of which is preserved in the same Vienna codex as Sklavos's poem. Of the rhymed poem there is no manuscript extant, but it was printed in a series of Venetian chapbooks from 1539 onwards and clearly enjoyed great popularity. It was probably written some time after 1495.¹¹

3) The long romantic poem *Erotokritos*, by Vitsentzos Kornaros, derives its plot from a French romance of chivalry. It is now generally accepted that it was written around 1600, but the earliest witness is a manuscript dated 1710, just three years before the first printed edition. On the explicit testimony of its first publisher, the poem circulated widely in manuscript before reaching the printing press. There is no reason to suspect significant corruption or rehandling of the text in the period between composition and printing.¹²

The *Συμφορά* contains a number of references to *telling* the story: an invocation to God for the understanding of the Holy Spirit, 'να δηγηθῶ τη συμφορά της Κρήτης τη μεγάλη' (verse 7), phrases like 'να πω και τ' άλλα πάντα' (12), 'να σας τ' αναφέρω' (26), 'κι ο λογισμός μου βιάζει με πάλι ν' αναθιβάλλω' (87), and rhetorical questions of the kind 'τίς άνθρωπος νά' χεν ιδεί . . .' (63). There are cliché half-lines like 'όλοι, μικροί, μεγάλοι' (109), 'σ' Ανατολή και Δύση' (206), and 'άρχοντες πλούσιοι και φτωχοί' (35), and a striking echo of folk song in the phrase: 'Όλα τα κάστρη κλαίγουσιν, Κρήτη, τον χαλασμό σου' (203).¹³ On the other hand there are many learned elements of vocabulary and morphology, often, but not exclusively, in passages of biblical or liturgical origin. The register wavers

11. The text is edited by L. Alexiou (1955), but a new critical edition of this undervalued poem is an urgent desideratum (P. Vasileiou has promised it).

12. The authoritative edition is that of S. Alexiou (1980 and 1985b), where the text of the publisher-printer's 'address to the readers', which prefaced the 1713 edition, will also be found. Alexiou (1985b: ιζ') dates the composition of the poem to between 1600 and 1610, but there is no compelling evidence to exclude the last decade of the sixteenth century.

13. Compare, for example, 'Ούλες οι χώρες χλίδουνται, ν-ούλες παρηγοριώνται' in a historical lament (Ioannou 1966: 97). For further examples of this formula in historical songs and laments see Herzfeld 1973.

from ecclesiastical or just plain pretentious (cf. 'Αλλ' επί το προκείμενον να στρέψωμεν το ρήμα' [167]), to colloquial language and style with examples of isometric parallelism, apostrophe, and dialogue. But the fact that we are dealing with a text conceived, composed and transmitted within a chirographic context is made apparent by the concluding lines in which the poet lays claim to ownership of the text and, for the second time, counts the number of verses:

Ως εδεπά τελειώνουνται μισό και κινητηνάρι
τα βέρσα τούτα πόκαμα με του Θεού την χάρη.

(281-2)¹⁴

By contrast the *Chapbook of the Donkey* begins with an immediate address to its audience:

Ἀρχοντες, να γρικήσετε, α θέλετε, δαμάκι (v.1).

Like all written texts the *Chapbook* has to fictionalise its audience (Ong 1982:102). It does so using a standard formula — and then gets on with telling the story. In the course of the story there are many references to learning and literacy. The Fox is an 'αστρονόμισσα', a pupil of Leo the Wise, a 'διδασκάλισσα του λόγου και του μύθου', and she knows the *Νομοκάνων* (code of canon law) by heart. The Donkey on the other hand is dismissed by the Fox as 'απαίδευτος' and told: 'δεν έχεις φρόνεσιν ουδέ κατέχεις γράμμα' (112). Like his companion in villainy, the Wolf is also presented as literate:

Ευθύς ο Λύκος έπιασε χαρτί και καλαμάρι,
Γαδάρου τ' αμαρτήματα εγράφου για να πάρη.

(323-4)

The Fox makes much play of citing relevant passages from the *Νομοκάνων* in order to pass sentence on the Donkey. The text sets up a clear relationship between literacy and power, on the one hand, and ignorance and vulnerability on the other. But the conclusion subverts that relationship: learning and literacy are not prerequisites for νόησις, which is given by God to the

14. One hundred and fifty 'βέρσα' (i.e. couplets) implies 300 lines, whereas in fact the manuscript contains only 282. The lacuna is probably to be located between lines 206 and 207.

Donkey so that the wickedness of the Fox and the Wolf may be punished:

και νόησιν του έδωσε αντάμα με την γνώση
διχώς να ξεύρη μάθημα και γράμμα ν' αναγνώση,
και ρήτορας εγίνηκε. . .

(525-7)

The Fox thus confers on the Donkey the supreme accolade of *rhetor*, which we can equate quite literally with mastery of the oral art of persuasion, as distinct from literate culture. Here we have a text which is highly aware of the orality/literacy divide: scholars who have sought allegorical interpretations in terms of social class and anti-ecclesiastical satire have not, as far as I know, fully appreciated this aspect. Of course the anonymous poet is himself literate and obliged to use the written word to make his point.¹⁵

Turning to our third text, the *Erotokritos*, we note that written texts and literacy are taken for granted (it is true that the setting is aristocratic); and yet there is a mutual dependence between writing and oral and other non-textual means of communication. A few examples must suffice to illustrate the point I wish to make:

1) From the poet's prologue to his story:

κι όποιος του πόθου εδούλεψε εισέ καιρό κιανένα
ας έρθη για ν' αφουκραστή ό,τί 'ναι εδώ γραμμένα

(I 11-12)

and:

Αφουκραστητε το λοιπό κι ας πιάνη οπού 'χει γνώση

(I 17).

The text is a written one, but the possibility of aural reception, as well as reading, is clearly envisaged. Similar references to the audience *hearing* the story abound in the text. Later, when

15. It is generally assumed that the Wolf represents the nobility, the Fox the monastic clergy, and the Donkey the masses; see, for example, S. Alexiou, in Panagiotakis 1988: 206-7. But the satire is aimed not merely in a general way at the aristocracy and clergy as exploiters and oppressors of the poor, but more specifically at the means which they employ, and in particular their use of literacy as a status symbol and a weapon.

Rotokritos declares his love to Aretousa, the narrator spares us a verbatim account but comments:

Τά 'λεγε, τ' ανεθίβανε, καθένας που διαβάζει
κι οπού 'κουσε κι οπού 'καμε, μπορεί να τα λογάζει.

(III 615-16)

Two interpretations are possible: either (1) anyone who is in the habit of reading (sc. stories of this kind), or who has heard such stories or experienced a similar situation, can imagine what Rotokritos said; or (2) anyone who is reading this poem from a written text, or has been listening to a reading of it by someone else, or has had such experience, can use his imagination. In either case the assumption is that the text is available to readers and listeners alike.

2) Aretousa, despite her tender years, is 'πολλά γραμματισμένη' (III 1607); she takes pleasure in reading 'βιβλία των φρόνιμων' (I 634). When Rotokritos sings his seductive songs beneath her window, what does she do? Like a good literate she writes them down, so that she can reread them whenever she likes:

Τα λόγια του τα γνωστικά κάθονται και λογάζω,
γραμμένα τά 'χω και συχνιά κλαίγοντας τα διαβάζω.
κι αλλού ποθές δεν τ' άκουσα μηδ' είδα τα γραμμένα. . .

(I 875-7)

They are original songs written specially for her. She confirms this by ruling out the other possibilities: either that they were popular songs that she might have heard performed, or that they belonged to the world of literature — in which case she would have come across them in her reading. Consequently, when she visits Rotokritos's home and finds a manuscript copy of the songs in his drawer, the serenader's identity is proved for her beyond doubt.

2) Each of the competitors in the tournament has an emblem consisting of both a pictorial representation and a written text, which explicates the picture. The emblem presupposes a literate society, but the description of each warrior's emblem presents a practical problem: how could the spectators have *read* texts inscribed on helmets — texts consisting of two or three lines of verse? Do

we assume that the inscriptions were read out as each competitor presented himself? Or that Kornaros has misunderstood the practicalities and placed on the helmet what should have been displayed on a large shield? It is not my purpose to answer these problematic questions here.¹⁶ However, we may note that if the emblem implies literacy, the picture part of it also *speaks* for itself. It is a sign intelligible to all, and can thus be seen as a link between literacy and orality.

There are many other aspects of the *Erotokritos* which can be connected with oral tradition: the frequent use of proverbial and gnomic utterances, stereotyped hemistichs of the kind ‘πεζοί και καβαλάροι’, ‘σ’ Ανατολή και Δύση’, ‘χειμώνα καλοκαίρι’, ‘κάμε να το κατέχης’, and a considerable use of antithetical structure. It has furthermore been pointed out that it would be possible to analyse the structure of the plot on the lines of Propp’s morphological analysis of the folk tale (A. Politis 1982:281; cf. Kapsomenos 1985). Yet at the same time it is inescapable that the poem is dependent on written sources, mimics the formal structure of neo-classical drama, and differs radically from folk song in its handling of the fifteen-syllable metre.

These three texts, written within the space of little more than a century on the island of Crete, thus present both similarities and contrasts in the extent to which an oral residue can be identified. Do they indeed belong to one and the same tradition? Are the differences due to the fact that they conform to the requirements of different genres — verse chronicle, fable/satire, romance? Or are we to identify a chronological progression, and if so what is it? Or does the *Erotokritos* represent a learned literary tradition influenced by contact with Italian writers like Boiardo and Ariosto, while the other two poems continue the tradition of late-Byzantine vernacular literature, which may well have sprung from a genuine oral tradition, or at least had some contact with one?

Differences of genre should certainly not be dismissed. In the case of Sklavos’s poem a useful connection can be made with the tradition of ‘popular, “semi-oral” poetry of topical/historical

16. See the discussion in Morgan 1967, and also the comment of S. Alexiou (1980: 417).

interest', which includes such works as the *Chronicle of the Morea*, and the *Ανακάλυμμα της Κωνσταντινόπολης*, which have been connected with the compositions of modern Cypriot ποιητάρηδες (Beaton 1987). One of the common features is the insistence on a precise date, often awkwardly adapted to the verse-form. In the *Συμφορά*:

Ἐτη ἐκ τῆς σαρκώσεως Χριστοῦ τοῦ ευεργέτη
 χίλια πεντακόσια τρέχοντας οκτώ ἔτι,
 μῆνός Μαΐου εἴκοσι ἐννέα καὶ τρέχοντας οἱ τράντα,
 μέρα Δευτέρα ἴτον ἀργά — νὰ πῶ καὶ τ' ἄλλα πάντα —,
 εἰς ὥρες δύο τῆς νυκτός, ὁ κύκλος τοῦ ἡλίου
 ἔτρεχεν τότες δεκαφτά, κ' ἔξι τοῦ φεγγαρίου.

(9-14)

The portentous tone can also be paralleled in the Cypriot tradition. The ποιητάρηδες compose and perform their works orally but depend on writing or printing to disseminate them. Such an ambivalence between written and oral modes is also present in Sklavos's poem, as we have seen: the preoccupation with authorship and the length of the work (almost as if he had been commissioned to write a poem of a certain length — payment by the couplet) sits oddly with the use of oral 'fillers', which he seems to slip in almost inadvertently. If there is an oral residue here it is *despite* the intentions and ambitions of Manolis Sklavos, who set out to record for posterity, through writing, the tragic events of 1508 and to warn his readers of the consequences of sin.¹⁷

With the *Chapbook of the Donkey* there is a much stronger impression of control over the means of expression. The opening address to a listening audience seems perfunctory, but is in fact brought into close relevance with the treatment of literacy and learning in the poem: neither the address to the ἀρχόντες nor the references to writing and the *Νομοκάνων* are present in the much less subtle treatment of the subject by the author of

17. An illuminating comparison could be made between Sklavos's poem and the version of the *Belisarios* poem by Emmanouil Limenitis (written 1498-9). Limenitis seems to have deliberately removed 'oral' elements in his adaptation (Bakker and van Gemert 1988: 75). The discussion of orality by Bakker and van Gemert (*ibid.* 71-5) in relation to the *Belisarios* poem (originally composed between 1391 and 1399) is outside our limited scope here, but contains much of relevance to a wider examination of orality in medieval Greek poetry.

the earlier version of the same story, the *Synaxarion*. The *Chapbook* subverts its own status as a written text by prioritising common sense over book-learning, oral skills over literacy. In the *Erotokritos* Kornaros is fully aware of the interrelationship and interdependence of the written text and oral delivery, and he makes due allowance for it. Throughout he is conscious of his dual audience, which perhaps help to explain that special quality of his style which Seferis called βηματισμός-recitatif (1981: 285-7).

In themselves these sporadic features of orality, or rather residual orality, do not of course oblige us to view the three works as belonging to a single tradition, rather than to separate high and low cultural levels. What we have ignored is the metrical common denominator: the πολιτικός στίχος with couplet rhyme. These are surely the controlling factors to which all three poets, once they had chosen their vehicle, had to submit and respond to the best of their ability. The syntactic patterns of fifteen-syllable verse have yet to be fully analysed, but one thing is clear: the metre tends to push key words or phrasal units of more than two syllables to particular parts of the verse. The result is not a formulaic structure like that of traditional oral poetry, but variation around more or less fixed points. When, for example, Kornaros wants to use the word ανιμένει/-η, in theory he has three options for where to place it; but 39 times he puts it at the end of the line (where it offers a convenient rhyme), as against only twice in syllables 2-5 and once in syllables 4-7.¹⁸ The structure of the fifteen-syllable is dependent on patterns evolved in oral poetry, or poetry orally performed, and such patterns remain highly influential on the compositional techniques of literate poets. Rhyme introduces a further constraint, but again one which is governed by aural factors.

To sum up: there are clear signs of an oral residue in Cretan narrative poetry of the sixteenth century. In a less sophisticated poet like Sklavos the oral features are paradoxically rather few and indeed appear accidental. Conversely the highly structured, metrically subtle and emotionally controlled *Erotokritos* reveals

18. The data is from the computerised concordance to the *Erotokritos* in preparation by Dia Philippides and the present writer.

a mature awareness of the interdependence of oral and written text. The *Chapbook* employs the oral address-formula much used in the ποιητάρηδες tradition, similarities with which we have also noted in Sklavos. Like both the *Συμφορά* and *Erotokritos* it is a moral tale; but it comes closer to the latter in conscious artistry.

In an age in which the highly educated were not cut off from popular culture it is more misleading than fruitful to divide Cretan poetic texts into distinct learned and popular traditions. In any case we must give due weight to the powerful connecting factor of the 'political' verse, and its inseparability from the oral tradition of folk poetry.

Selwyn College, Cambridge

References

- Alexiou, L. 1955. 'Η Φυλλάδα του Γαδάρου ήτοι Γαδάρου, λύκου και αλεπούς [sic] διήγησις ωραία', *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 9:81-118.
- Alexiou, S. 1963. 'Απόκοπος', *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 17:183-251.
- 1971. *Μπεργαδής Απόκοπος. Η Βοσκοποθλα* (Athens).
- 1980. *Βιτσέντζος Κορνάρος. Ερωτόκριτος. Κριτική έκδοση, εισαγωγή, σημειώσεις, γλωσσάριο* (Athens).
- 1985a. *Η Κρητική Λογοτεχνία και η εποχή της. Μελέτη φιλολογική και ιστορική* (Athens).
- 1985b. *Βιτσέντζος Κορνάρος. Ερωτόκριτος* (Athens).
- Alexiou, S. and Aposkiti, M. 1988. *Ερωφίλη. Τραγωδία Γεωργίου Χορτάτση* (Athens).
- Bakker, W.F. and van Gemert, A.F. 1988. *Ιστορία του Βελισαρίου. Κριτική έκδοση των τεσσάρων διασκευών με εισαγωγή, σχόλια και γλωσσάριο* (Athens).
- Beaton, R. 1987. 'Modern ποιητάρηδες and medieval poetry in vernacular Greek'. *Πρακτικά Β' Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου*, III (Nicosia), 485-494.
- Bouboulidis, F.K. 1955. *Η Συμφορά της Κρήτης του Μανόλη Σκλάβου. Κρητικόν στιχούργημα του ΙΣΤ' αιώνος* (Athens).
- van Gemert, A.F. 1980. 'Ο Στέφανος Σαχλίκης και η εποχή του', *Θησαυρίσματα* 17: 36-130.
- Herzfeld, M. 1973. "'The Siege of Rhodes'" and the ethnography of Greek oral tradition', *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 25: 413-40.
- Holton, D. (ed.) forthcoming. *Literature and Society in Renaissance Crete* (Cambridge).
- Ioannou, G. 1966. *Τα δημοτικά μας τραγούδια. Εκλογή — εισαγωγή — σχόλια* (Athens).
- Kapsomenos, E. 1985. 'Η δομή της αφήγησης στον "Ερωτόκριτο"', *Πεπραγμένα του Ε' Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου*, Τόμος Β' (Iraklio) 164-81.

- Kechagioglou, G. 1982. *Λαϊκά λογοτεχνικά έντυπα I. Απόκοπος, Απολώνιος, Ιστορία της Σωσάννης* (Athens).
- Layton, E. forthcoming. 'Zacharias and Nikolaos Kallierges and the first edition of the *Apokopos* of Bergadis', *Θησαυρίσματα*.
- Morgan, G. 1960. 'Cretan poetry: sources and inspiration', *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 14: 7-68, 203-270, 379-434.
- 1967. 'The emblems of Erotokritos', *The Texas Quarterly* 10: 241-68.
- Ong, W.J. 1982. *Orality and Literacy. The Technologizing of the Word* (London and New York).
- Panagiotakis, N. 1987b. 'Μελετήματα περί Σαχλίκη', *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 27: 7-58.
- (ed.) 1988. *Κρήτη. Ιστορία και πολιτισμός*. Τόμος Β' (Iraklio).
- Panajotakis, N. 1987a. 'Sachlikisstudien', in H. Eideneier (ed.) *Neograeca Medii Aevi. Text und Ausgabe. Akten zum Symposium Köln 1986* (Cologne) 219-78.
- Politis, A. 1982. 'Το βιβλίο μέσο παραγωγής της προφορικής γνώσης. Δυσκολίες και προβληματισμοί γύρω από το θέμα', in *Το βιβλίο στις προβιομηχανικές κοινωνίες. Πρακτικά του Α' Διεθνούς Συμποσίου του Κέντρου Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών* (Athens) 271-82.
- Politis, L. 1973. *A History of Modern Greek Literature* (Oxford).
- 1977. 'Venezia come centro della stampa e della diffusione della prima letteratura neoellenica', in *Venezia centro di mediazione tra Oriente e Occidente (secoli XV-XVI). Aspetti e problemi*, II (Florence) 443-82.
- Puchner, W. 1983. 'Η "Ερωφίλη" στη δημόδη παράδοση της Κρήτης', *Αριάδνη* 1: 173-235.
- Seferis, G. 1981. *Δοκιμές. Πρώτος τόμος (1936-1947)*. 4th ed. (Athens).
- Tsavari, I. 1987. *Ο Πουολόγος. Κριτική έκδοση με εισαγωγή, σχόλια και λεξιλόγιο* (Athens).

Peasant Categories in the Tenth and eleventh centuries

ALAN HARVEY

The need for the state to protect its fiscal revenues is presented in the tenth-century legislation as a significant factor underlying the efforts made by the imperial administration to check the growing power of its provincial magnates and to make it more difficult for them to extend their properties at the expense of weaker peasants. In practice the most effective way for the state to maintain its revenues was to ensure through the regular activities of its fiscal officials that peasants who owed tax-payments to the state were not brought under the control of powerful lay and ecclesiastical landowners.¹

Two documents which date from 974 and 975 illustrate this process clearly. They concern new assessments in the theme of Thessalonike which were intended to restore the state's claims to obligations from all the *stratiotai*, *prosodiaroi* and *demosiaroi* who had sought refuge on the estates of the church or *archontes*. While Ostrogorsky had some justification in linking these actions with the tenth century legislation, they were also part of a regular process throughout the Byzantine period by which the state's fiscal administration sought to keep up to date with changes in land-holding and to ensure the state obtained the revenue to which it was entitled.²

1. A Harvey, *Economic Expansion in the Byzantine Empire 900-1200* (Cambridge 1990).

2. P. Lemerle, A. Guillou, N. Svoronos, D. Papachryssanthou, *Actes de Lavra. Première partie. Des origines à 1204* (Archives de l'Athos, V) (Paris 1970) no.6. J. Lefort, N. Oikonomides, D. Papachryssanthou, *Actes d'Iviron, I, Des origines au milieu du XIe siècle* (Archives de l'Athos, XIV), (Paris 1985) no.2. G. Ostrogorsky, *Quelques problèmes d'histoire de la paysannerie byzantine* (Brussels 1956).

The categories of peasants which appear in these texts are not well documented apart from the *stratiotes* about which much has been written. Another category, the *exkoussatoi tou dromou*, appears in an eleventh century document and its meaning is also obscure. All these terms have a tenth or eleventh century context and afterwards disappear from the sources. This paper will consider the limited amount of evidence available to throw some light on the definition of these terms and to discuss briefly the economic changes which explain why these peasant categories disappeared.³

The first consideration is whether these groups of peasants owned the land which they cultivated or held it as *paroikoi*. The term *exkoussatoi* is clearly linked to *exkoussesia*. The latter term regularly appears in the sources as a concession by the state to a landowner of the rights to the fiscal revenues from the *paroikoi* which were installed on the landowner's properties. The *exkoussesia* is best regarded in these cases as a transfer of revenues from the state to the landowner. The scope of the grant could vary; the state could retain its rights to claim some obligations while conceding others or it could make a complete concession of all the obligations imposed on the *paroikoi*.⁴ The term *exkoussatoi dromou* appears only once in the sources in an eleventh century chrysobull. This referred to an earlier chrysobull issued by Constantine VII which allowed the monastery of St. Andrew at Peristerai an exemption for a hundred *paroikoi* and *douloparoikoi* provided that they were *ateleis* (not owing any tax-payment to the state) and were not *stratiotai*, *demosiarioi* or *exkoussatoi tou dromou*.⁵ It is likely that this section of the surviving chrysobull copies fairly closely the tenth century document which does not survive.

In addition to the reference to the *exkoussatoi dromou* the term *exkoussatoi* appears in the sources in a variety of contexts. It was used to describe properties which were subject to the grant of

3. P. Lemerle, *The Agrarian History of Byzantium from the Origins to the Twelfth Century. The Sources and the Problems* (Galway 1979) 167-77. Ostrogorsky, *Quelques problèmes*.

4. Harvey, *Economic Expansion*, 46-7. Lemerle, *The Agrarian History*, 173-5.

5. *Actes de Lavra*, no.33.

an *exkoussēia*. Constantine VII had granted to a monastery, Leontia, the rights to thirty-six *exkoussatoi oikoi* in the theme of Thessalonike. When Theodore Kladon made an assessment of the region in 975, he was unable to find them — he attributed this to invasions. Although he was not able to restore them to the monastery, he did confirm its rights to recover them and to claim the payments incumbent on them.⁶ Between 975 and 984 Lavra had received a grant of twenty-five *exkoussatoi oikoi* in Chrysoupolis from Basil II.⁷ In 1102 Lavra received a privilege relating to four boats which were described as *exkoussata ploia*.⁸ In these instances the term *exkoussatos* simply refers to properties over which the state had relinquished its fiscal claims and in the case of the *exkoussatoi oikoi* had allowed the landowner to collect the revenues instead. The term also appears in some literary works. Basil the Younger, archbishop of Caesareia, referred to imperial armourers who were known as *exkoussatoi*.⁹ Another group of *exkoussatoi* are mentioned in the *De Cerimoniis*. Their responsibility was to provide fish for the imperial table.¹⁰ It is likely that these groups were exempted from some fiscal obligations in return for the performance of their special duties. In the case of the *exkoussatoi tou dromou* there are two possible explanations: first, that they performed some special service to the *dromos* for which they received some fiscal concessions; second, that their obligations to the state were not altered, but they were specifically transferred to the *dromos*. It is impossible to determine the relationship between the *exkoussatoi tou dromou* and the holders of the *dromikai strateiai* referred to by Zonaras.¹¹ The latter were clearly independent tax-payers owing

6. *Actes d'Iviron*, no.2.

7. *Ibid*, no.6.

8. *Actes de Lavra*, no.55.

9. R. Cantella, 'Basilio Minimo II', *BZ* 26 (1926) 31 lines 1-3. See also A.P. Kazhdan, A.W. Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (University of California, Berkeley, Los Angeles 1985) 19-20.

10. *Constantini Porphyrogeniti Imperatoris De Cerimoniis Aulae Byzantini Libri duo*, ed. J.J. Reiske (2 vols., Bonn 1829) 488-9.

11. *Ioannis Zonarae Epitome Historiarum*, ed. M. Pinder, T. Büttner-Wobst (3 vols., Bonn 1841-97) III, 506. Ostrogorsky, *Quelques problèmes*.

payments to the *dromos* just as the *stratiotai* did to the department of the *stratitikon*.

In the 970s successive fiscal enquiries were conducted to reestablish the state's claims over peasants from whom it was entitled to exact revenues. John Tzimiskes instructed officials in the theme of Thessalonike and Strymon to make enquiries concerning peasants liable to the *strateia* and also the *prosodiarior* and the *demosiarior* and in those instances where peasants with obligations to the treasury were found established on the property of the church or of *archontika prosopa*, their payments to the treasury were to be reimposed. In 974 the *ekprosopou* of the theme, Symeon, made an assessment of the *kastron* of Hierissos where he found some *demosiarior* and reimposed taxes on them. Other peasants who were not *demosiarior* were left in the possession of Lavra which was entitled by chrysobull to thirty-two *paroikoi* in the area.¹² In 975 Theodore Kladon made an assessment of the theme of Thessalonike and carried out the same procedure leaving the monasteries of Kolobou, Polygyros and Leontia with the *paroikoi* to whom they were entitled by chrysobull.¹³ The precise status of the peasants reclaimed by the state is not in all instances completely clear. The case of those subject to the *strateia* is straightforward: these were peasants occupying their own land and liable either to provide a soldier for the thematic army or a cash payment instead.¹⁴ The other categories are much less well documented. Lemerle regards the *prosodiarior* as peasants who were liable to pay the *prosodion*.¹⁵ The exact nature of this tax is very problematical. Although it is obviously some sort of fiscal due, the circumstances in which it was exacted are unclear. In 1074 Lavra received a chrysobull confirming that the *dioiketes* of Boleron, Strymon and Thessalonike was not entitled to claim the *prosodion* from one of Lavra's estates, Bratzeba. An examination of the records of the department *ton oikeiakon* found that the obligation had never been paid on this property. Moreover, the exactions made by the *dioiketai* were

12. *Actes de Lavra*, no.6.

13. *Actes d'Ivion*, no.2.

14. Lemerle, *The Agrarian History*, 115ff.

15. *Ibid.*, 176 no.2. See also *Actes de Lavra*, I, 108; *Actes d'Ivion*, 111.

restricted to those payments which were recorded in the tax-registers for the estate and they had no rights to claim the *prosodion*.¹⁶ The obligation appears in some documents in the list of charges included in the fiscal privileges granted to landowners. The *prosodion* appears to have been a payment in kind related to military campaigns. In an exemption of 995 it was included with charges which were exacted in connection with military campaigns, the *kastroktisia*, *mitaton* and *chorton*.¹⁷

The term *demosiarios* was probably reserved for a peasant who was liable to pay the *demosion* to the state. As the *demosion* was the land-tax, whose payment was used as evidence of landownership, it seems that the *demosiarioi* were not *paroikoi* of the state but independent peasant tax-payers. Where Symeon and Theodore Kladon found *demosiarioi*, they imposed tax-payments on them. There is no reason to believe that the peasants had been *paroikoi* in these cases. The latest surviving references to the *demosiarioi* come in two eleventh century documents which deal with earlier privileges granted in the tenth century. In the chrysobull of 1060 granted to Lavra the reference to *demosiarioi* comes in a section which appears to be a recapitulation of Constantine VII's chrysobull.¹⁸ The only reference in this period to *demosiarioi paroikoi* is contained in Dölger's edition of an act dating to either 1059 or 1074 which summarises a chrysobull issued by Basil II in 979-80 to John Tornikios. It contained a grant of sixty *demosiarioi paroikoi* as well as forty *ateleis paroikoi*. The document actually states *demosiarioi oikoi*, which is perfectly satisfactory, and Dölger's correction of *oikoi* to *paroikoi* is unnecessary. Nevertheless, in this case we are dealing with the transfer of revenues from the state to a landowner. The precise range of revenues which the landowner was entitled to extract from these peasants is not stipulated in the text and Basil's original chrysobull does not survive.¹⁹ In these circumstances the dividing line be-

16. *Actes de Lavra*, no.36.

17. *Actes d'Iviron*, no.8. The *prosodion* also appears in a chrysobull of 1082, M. Goudas, 'Byzantina engrapha tes en Atho hieras mones tou Batopediou', *EEBS* 3 (1926) no.3, 127.

18. *Actes de Lavra*, no.33 line 33.

19. F. Dölger, 'Ein Fall slavischer Einsiedlung im Hinterland von Thessalonike im 10. Jahrhundert', *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*,

tween independent peasants and *paroikoi* could be a narrow one. One the state had transferred its claims to the peasants' tax-payments, there was always the possibility that their status would in the long run be affected and they would eventually be regarded as *paroikoi* of the landowner.

The appearance of these terms in the sources of the tenth and eleventh century and their almost complete disappearance subsequently was a reflection of change in the rural economy. In the tenth century legislation the state appears concerned to preserve peasants who owned the land they cultivated from coming under the control of powerful landowners. One of the reasons for this is that it was protecting its own interests due to the tax revenues it received from these peasants. As independent peasants became a less significant proportion of the rural economy, the focus of the state's interest switched and the revenues it obtained from its own properties became more important.²⁰ Most of the rural population were *paroikoi* of either the state or private landowners. Consequently, the peasant categories in the documents under discussion declined in significance. In the eleventh century the obligations owed by the *stratiotes* were extensively commuted into cash payments and in later centuries the term was used to refer to soldiers who received fiscal revenues through grants of *pro-noia*.²¹ The *exkoussatoi tou dromou* never appear in any document after Lavra's chrysobull of 1060. There is only one later reference to *demosiarioi*. In 1235 some inhabitants of Mantaia near Smyrna were referred to as *demosiarioi paroikoi* (the only occasion when the expression *demosiarioi paroikoi* appears in the sources).²² The use of the expression here in a different context from the earlier references to *demosiarioi* reflects the social and economic changes which had occurred in the intervening period. The decline in importance of an independent peasantry is clearly

philosophisch-historische Klasse (1952, Heft 1) 7. Dölger's correction has been omitted in the re-edition of this passage in *Actes d'Iviron*, pp.11-12. See also Lemerle, *The Agrarian History*, 69 n.2.

20. N. Oikonomidès, 'L'évolution de l'organisation administrative de l'empire byzantin au XI^e siècle (1025-1118)', *TM* 6 (1976) 125-52.

21. Harvey, *Economic Expansion*, 72-3, 110-14.

22. F. Miklosich, J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata Graeca medii aevi* (6 vols., Vienna 1860-90) IV, 38.

shown by two fiscal documents of the late twelfth century. In 1175 Andronikos Doukas, the *doux* and *apographeus* of the theme of Mylasa and Melanoudion issued instructions that the property of the monastery of St. Paul on Latros should be assessed and that the monastery should be left in possession of the *paroikoi* to which it was entitled. Not all the *paroikoi* which it held were accounted for by its privileges and a number were claimed by the state and registered in the *demosiaka praktika*.²³ In 1189 there was another enquiry into the military, ecclesiastical and monastic properties in the theme. In this case the intention was to claim for the state those *paroikoi* which landowners were not entitled to hold.²⁴ These enquiries were similar in nature to those carried out in the 970s by the *ekprosopou* Symeon and Theodore Kladon. The significant difference was that the latter were looking to reclaim for the state peasants who paid taxes on their own land, but by the late twelfth century entitlement to *paroikoi* had become the major issue.

*Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern
Greek Studies, University of Birmingham*

23. *Ibid.*, 317-18.

24. *Ibid.*, 319-20.

Text as Song: The Oral Aspirations of Anghelos Sikelianos

SARAH EKDAWI

'Any poem or poet worthy of the name must liberate the pure creative force of the human voice.'

'The whole of Ancient Greek civilization is a product of poetic utterance: Homer sang; Pindar declaimed; Aeschylus spoke out from behind masks.'

'Ancient texts — Homer, Hesiod, oracles, Orphic writings and so forth — gradually became the voice of the people.'

These statements were made by Sikelianos in a talk entitled 'Ὁ ποιητικός προφορικός Λόγος καὶ ἡ ἐποχή μας',¹ which he delivered in 1938, and in which he postulates a historical progression from text to voice, rather than the reverse process. They are the statements of a literate poet writing in a literate age, but delighting, at the same time, in the ability of radio to 'reassert the spell of orality' (Havelock 1986: 31). They subvert the idea of literacy as progress and propose, in its place, an ideal of post-textual orality. The aim of this paper is to explore the relationship between such statements and the poetry of Sikelianos.

In his work — and allegedly in his manner of working — Sikelianos consistently privileges orality over literacy. He does not aspire to the state of non-literacy defined by Walter Ong as 'primary orality' (Ong 1982), Geoffrey Kirk as 'pre-literacy' (Kirk 1985) and Eric Havelock as 'oralism' (Havelock 1986), but rather to a state which one might term 'post-literacy'. The aspiration to orality is not, for Sikelianos, a denial of textuality, but an affirmation of the oral function of texts; of the absolute necessity for text to become voice. To this end, he constantly emphasizes his preference for oral methods of composition, storage and

1. A public lecture, reprinted in Sikelianos, *Πεζός Λόγος*, edited by G.P. Savvidis, Athens 1980, vol. 4, 141-151.

dissemination, as well as exploiting the aural possibilities of language within his poetry. It is significant that the two kinds of text which Sikelianos produced were referred to by him as 'traghoudi' (song) and its cognate 'tragodia' (tragedy). The first part of this paper will be concerned with the methods of composition, storage and dissemination apparently preferred by Sikelianos, and the second part, with oral-aural aspects of his poetry.

As far as Sikelianos may have known, Homer was blind, and therefore unlikely to have composed in writing. Although this premiss is now disputed by scholars (Kirk 1984, 1985) and 'blind singer' is regarded as little more than a cliché — perhaps not unlike the more recent 'blind piano-tuner' — the conclusion cannot be discounted, since alphabetization and literacy are not considered to have pre-dated Homer by very long (Kirk 1985). Sikelianos was at pains to demonstrate to those who knew him that he had no need of writing in order to compose, and appears to have associated this 'spontaneity' with inspiration, if not with Homer.

Eva Sikelianou, writing in an American magazine during the poet's lifetime (Palmer-Sikelianou 1942:24), remarks of Sikelianos: 'In composing poems, even long ones, he never seemed to work over them, at least not with pencil and paper.' Anna Sikelianou provides detailed accounts of the poet's *modus operandi* which confirm this. She describes the composition of 'Σόλωνος Ἀπόλογος' (L.V., 5, 155-9)² and 'Ἀγραφον' (L.V., 5, 148-150), both of which were apparently composed and written down spontaneously and without revision (Sikelianou 1985: 145-151). In the case of 'Σόλωνος Ἀπόλογος', the poet even refused pencil and paper, saying that he could recall the poem perfectly. Karandonis also supports claims that Sikelianos worked in this way, basing his conclusions on conversations with the poet as well as familiarity with the poetry. He writes: 'His poems arrived ready-made from within him, like Athena from the head of Zeus' (Karandonis 1952: 23).

2. All references are to the five-volume edition of *Λυρικός Βίος* (L.V.), edited by G.P. Savvidis, Athens 1978. The first number refers to the volume; the second to the page.

If there is oral evidence, in the form of eye-witness accounts, for the 'oral' (inspired, spontaneous, non-written) composition methods of Sikelianos, there is also, as Dimitris Gounelas has pointed out (Gounelas 1989), documentary evidence for a rather different method of composition, in the form of heavily corrected and re-worked manuscripts.³ There is, too, a remarkable resemblance between Anna Sikelianou's account of the composition of 'Ἀγραφον' (Sikelianou 1985: 145-6) and a scene from 'Μήτηρ Θεοῦ' (L.V., 4, 36), in which a man closes his book, at dusk, the better to observe 'bright spirits', just as Sikelianos closed his book, one evening, and stared at phantoms invisible to his companions, as he composed 'Ἀγραφον'. All this suggests that Sikelianos was determined to create the impression that he wrote rapidly, without the need for corrections or reworkings — but why?

There is an obvious connection between speed and orality. Successful oral discourse cannot afford exorbitant pauses. It must be fluent. It cannot go back and correct itself. It has to be — or at least appear to be — spontaneous. This is one of the aspects of orality to which Sikelianos aspired: speed/spontaneity. In his 'Ὠδή στό Βαλαωρίτη' (L.V., 2, 70), Sikelianos claims to be writing faster than the speed of speech: 'Ὁ στίχος γράφει πιότερο γοργός ἀπ' τή μιλή'; and in 'Μήτηρ Θεοῦ', he writes: 'Τό χέρι μου γοργό φτερό σά νά 'ναι γράφει', an image reiterated by Anna Sikelianou, in her comment about how rapidly Sikelianos wrote poetry: 'Γιά τά ποιήματα ἦταν γοργόφτερος' (Sikelianou 1985: 127). This Romantic ideal of poetry as inspired out-pouring is not, however, to be confused with the 'automatic writing' of the Surrealists, at which Sikelianos and Seferis both publicly sneered, the latter dubbing it 'facile poetry' (Seferis 1974a: 485) and the former expressing grave doubts about whether it was poetry at all (Sikelianos 1944: 247-253).

It is curious in itself that one of the poems which Sikelianos was at pains to demonstrate was inspired, and written rapidly,

3. In addition to the source quoted by Gounelas, both the Centre for Asia Minor Studies and ELIA in Athens hold sizeable collections of heavily reworked Sikelianos manuscripts.

should have been "Ἀγραφόν". Everything that happens in life, according to one current in Greek thought, is written down: 'γραπτό', 'γραμμένο'. Unforeseeable and generally rather unpleasant occurrences are said to be 'ἀπό τὰ ἄγραφα'. On the other hand, τὰ Ἄγραφα — the 'Unwritten Lands' — an area in Roumeli, remained autonomous during the Turkish occupation, and therefore became symbolic, in popular tradition, of freedom from tyranny. In 'Φθινόπωρο 1936' (L.V., 5, 71), Sikelianos calls love 'the unwritten space' ('ἄγραφος χώρος'), which seems to imply the unwritable or inexpressible. All these associations of the term 'ἄγραφον', some of them conflicting, are relevant to the poem "Ἀγραφόν", whose title may also be taken to mean 'apocryphal', since the poem refers to an 'unrecorded' (in the gospels) tradition about Christ. It would appear that one of the literate aspirations of Sikelianos was to write the unwritable.

Sikelianos seems to have viewed writing itself as a necessary evil. Eva Sikelianou's account is surely exaggerated, in this particular, and is not substantiated by any of the poet's other acquaintances, yet it may contain a modicum of truth: 'Gradually the act of writing became burdensome to him: he would compose and recite new poems with ease, but recording them became difficult' (Palmer-Sikelianou 1942: 24). That Sikelianos had a prodigious memory, and was able to recite poetry (both his own and that of others) without recourse to the texts themselves, is testified by many of his friends and acquaintances, including Kleon Paraschos (Paraschos 1937: 163-4) and Elias Venezis (Venezis 1952: 4), as well as by Eva Sikelianou and Anna Sikelianou. If memory was the ideal storage place and recitation the ideal method of dissemination, books did have their uses (to be discussed below) and reading aloud to an audience was not a bad approximation to reciting from memory.

Kazantzakis claimed that Sikelianos once attempted to resuscitate a corpse (Kazantzakis 1965: 233-5). Certainly, the affirmation of, and indeed insistence upon, resurrection, by whatever means, haunts the poetry of Sikelianos. The word κείμενο (text) is, of course, related to the word κεῖται, which appears on tombstones in the expression ἐνθάδε κεῖται (here lies). Text and tomb have a shared inertia, a lack of dynamism, and

the very fact that texts appear on tombstones suggests a relationship of contiguity between writing and death. In 'Μήτηρ Θεοῦ', Sikelianos explicitly compares his own text to the writing on a tombstone: "Ἀρχίζ' ἡ πλάκα γράφοντας, καθὼς ἐδῶ τό γράφω". Yet, writing can defeat death, because at the end of 'Μήτηρ Θεοῦ', the poet's dead sister has, we are told, been brought back 'ὀλοζώντανη'. Here, Sikelianos chooses the verb 'ζωγραφίζω', with its life-affirming root, to describe the activity of writing. By applying this verb ('to paint') to writing, he seems to extend its meaning to something like 'bringing to life in writing'. In order for the text itself to be brought back to life, breath — or voice — is necessary. On his death-bed, Sikelianos requested his wife to read 'Μήτηρ Θεοῦ' to him. Thus a symbolic resuscitation of the poet, through his poem, was effected (Sikelianou 1985: 203).

The activity of writing (as opposed to uttering) is rarely presented by Sikelianos in a favourable light. Books themselves are shown to have a function as *aide-mémoire*, and in 'Μήτηρ Θεοῦ' the poet mentions another practical application of books: pressing flowers. In conversation (Athens, March 1989), Anna Sikelianou has said that when Sikelianos came across a passage or poem which he particularly liked in a book, he used to tear the page out and carry it around until he had memorized it, whereupon he would throw the page away. This calculated disrespect for literacy, privileging as it does memory over print, seems to indicate that Sikelianos took Plato's strictures about the damaging effects of writing on memory very much to heart (Plato, *Phaedrus*).

Mnemosyne was the mother of the Muses, and there are other instances in both the life and work of Sikelianos where memory is shown to be paramount. In "Ὁ Χορός τοῦ Πινδάρου", (L.V., 5, 31), for example, poets are said to move 'στῆς Μνήμης βαθιά τό φῶς' and in 1946, outraged at not having been awarded the Nobel Prize for literature, Sikelianos gave an impromptu recitation from 'Πάσχα τῶν Ἑλλήνων' (L.V., 4, 41-141) on a public tram (Sikelianou 1985: 118-119). Thus Sikelianos employed memory for the purposes of composition, storage and dissemination.

Mario Vitti has pointed out that the demotic — or 'new koine', as he calls it — of the Generation of 1930 tended, in their poetry, to follow the syntax of ordinary speech (Vitti 1979: 174). This tendency emphasized the oral origins of literary demotic. Sikelianos, although himself a demoticist, favours a highly complex, even convoluted, syntax in his poetry, introducing unfamiliar word-order as well as archaisms and dialect words and forms. These features do not exactly make his texts easily accessible to a listening, as opposed to reading, public, and yet they have extremely respectable oral precedents in the mixed language of Homer and the convoluted syntax of Pindar. It is to these 'songs', rather than to folksong, for example, that Sikelianos aspired, and whatever his understanding of Homeric orality and composition methods, his own occasional use of an adapted folksong formula (such as the conflation of various Digenis and 'charopalema' elements at the beginning of 'Βλαχογιάννης', L.V., 5, 23), represents a borrowing from texts (printed collections of folksongs) rather than direct oral influence.

*

A curious factor in literary criticism concerning Sikelianos is that the content of his poetry has proved to be a lasting source of distraction from the form. Early readers, such as Xydis, marvelled at the realistic evocations of the Greek landscape and traditional Greek life⁴ (Xydis 1979: 230-235), while later readers, including Mario Vitti, have been dismissive of the poet's ideology (Vitti 1979: 300-303). In the first case, content has served to justify form, and in the second, to devalue it. Yet to privilege content over form in Sikelianos is surely to miss the point; reading Sikelianos purely for his ideas is comparable to reading Seferis for his plots or Solomos for his convincing characterization. It is time to start reading Sikelianos as Sikelianos read Sikelianos: aloud.

4. Xydis is particularly impressed by the 'facts' presented in 'Θαλερό' (L.V., 2, 119-121); which he himself verified by going to the village and making enquiries (Xydis 1979: 230-235).

Where Sikelianos is concerned, orality is required on the part of the reader. Many a critic has made many a passing reference to the musical qualities of the best Sikelianos poetry, but none has suggested that sound in Sikelianos is paramount. Edmund Keeley's article, 'Sikelianos, the Sublime Voice' (Keeley 1983: 31-42), for example, is almost entirely taken up with what that voice said. The rest of this paper will be concerned with how.

Sound patterns are ubiquitous in the poetry of Sikelianos, and are both functional and decorative. Their function is not obviously mnemonic or incantatory, but has more to do with reinforcing meaning by highlighting key words, lines or ideas and creating or strengthening associations between words. Choice of metre seems to play a greater role in situating a poem within a particular tradition than that played by rhyme and other sound patterns. Thus the fifteen-syllable lines of 'Μήτηρ Θεοῦ' or the eleven-syllable lines of 'Ἱερὰ Ὀδός' (L.V., 5, 41-5) may point to connections with Greek folksong and Italian tradition respectively.⁵ Rhyme and the various other repetitions of line, phrase, word, syllable, consonant and vowel which constitute sound patterns are less easy to use as a basis for connecting a poem to a given tradition and are therefore, perhaps, more autonomous and self-referential within a poem than metre is. The following list of briefly annotated examples is intended to give some indication of the importance of sound in Sikelianos.

- (1) Cross-poem alliteration: associated words from the love poems 'Ἱμεροί' (L.V., 5, 61-120), all beginning with the same sound. (Key word: πόθος, the Modern Greek equivalent of the archaic ἵμερος)
 Πόθος — πιθυμιά, πηγή, πληγή, πάθος, πνοή, παλμός, πρῶτος, παρθενιά, πλαγιάζω, ποτίζει.
- (2) Alliteration of the same kind within a single one of the 'Ἱμεροί', 'Ἀλὶθ' (L.V., 5, 100-104)
 Πάλι, πολεμικό, Πούλια, πληγές, παράδεισος, παλεύοντας, παλιοί πολεμιστές.

5. The metre of 'Ἱερὰ Ὀδός', although not terza rima, may underline a thematic link with the opening of Dante's *Inferno*.

- (3) Key word, Λιλίθ, prefigured by sounds in the lines before it appears ('Λιλίθ')
- λύθηκαν . . . πάλι . . . γλυκό . . . λιοντάρι . . . γλείφει
 . . . πληγές . . . παλιοί . . . καντήλια . . . όλόκληρη
 . . . Λιλίθ.
- (4) As (3), but from the poem 'Πάν' (L.V., 2, 117-118). Key word: τράγος
- βράχια . . . τραχιᾶς . . . σμάραγδο . . . τρέμοντας . . .
 τριήρη . . . τραχιά . . . δάχτυλο . . . γλώσσα . . .
 τριγύρ' . . . ἄρχος καὶ ταγός — ὁ τράγος.
- (5) Actual mingling of sounds to reinforce 'mingling' ('σμίγον-
 τας'), in the poem 'Στό ἔρμο χωράφι ἐκεῖ στή Σαλαμίνα'
 (L.V., 5, 68-70)
- ἡ σιγή Σου μέ τήν σιγή μου σμίγοντας.
- (6) Sound (initial 'αν-') to reinforce thematic associations: Spring,
 in the poem 'Στ' Ὕσιου Λουκᾶ τό Μοναστήρι' (L.V., 5,
 46-48)
- ἀνθούς, ἀναπνοές τῆς ἀνοιξης, ἀναφτερῶναν,
 Ἀνάστασης, ἀνεμώνες, Ἀνέστη.
- (7) Three decorative patterns: (a) 'loosening sequence', in which
 an initial consonant cluster recurs in a subsequent word,
 separated by an intervening vowel or vowels; (b) 'tightening
 sequence', in which consonants from a preceding word are
 brought closer together by the removal of intervening vowels;
 (c) chiasmus, in which an element, e.g. vowel plus consonant,
 is reversed (Masson 1967: 4); 'Στ' Ὕσιου Λουκᾶ τό
 Μοναστήρι'
- (a) ὅσες . . . στολίσουν
 (b) πόνος . . . ἀναπνοές
 (c) κάρφωσε . . . κατώφλι.
- (8) Key line in which all sounds are repeated except 'μ', if σ/ζ
 and κ/χ equivalence is accepted; 'Στ' Ὕσιου Λουκᾶ τό
 Μοναστήρι'
- μά τά κεριά στό χέρι τόν κοιτάζαν.
- (9) Word within words: 'you' ('σύ') concealed and then revealed
 in "Ἡ κορφή τοῦ Νισύρου" (L.V., 5, 97-99)
- (συννέφιασε), Νισύρου, (βροντήσει), βασίλισσα,
 σάμπως σεισμός νά τά σεῖ, Σύ (parentheses indicate
 unstressed 'σύ').

To conclude, one of the most interesting and least commented upon aspects of the poetry of Sikelianos is its exploitation of sound. The more popular — and generally the more successful — of the poems are those in which there is a high frequency of sound patterns. In the earlier poems, sound patterning is largely achieved through metre and rhyme, whereas in the later poems more unusual and original techniques, such as the ones outlined in the examples above, are employed as well. Sikelianos, as Markos Avgeris pointed out (Avgeris 1952: 31), directed much effort towards 'τή μεγαλύτερη ήχητικότητα στό στίχο, καί μιὰ βαθύφωνη (. . .) μουσικότητα' and 'ένοιωθε τήν ανάγκη καί ν' άπαγγέλλει τούς στίχους του'.

St. Cross College, Oxford

References

- Avgeris, M. 1952. 'Ο Σικελιανός (Athens).
 Gounelas, C.D. 1989. 'Μιά άποψη γιά τήν πράξη τής δημιουργίας βασισμένη σέ ποιητικό χειρόγραφο του 'Α Σικελιανού' (unpublished lecture).
 Havelock, E.A. 1986. *The Muse Learns to Write: Reflections on Orality and Literacy from Antiquity to the Present* (New Haven and London).
 Karandonis, A. 1952. 'Στοχασμοί γιά τήν ποίηση του 'Α. Σικελιανού', *Νέα Έστία*, vol.52, no.611 (Christmas 1952): 22-30.
 Kazantzakis, N. 1965. *Αναφορά στόν Γκρέκο* (Athens).
 Keeley, E. 1983. *Modern Greek Poetry: Voice and Myth* (Princeton).
 Kirk, G. 1984. Introduction to *Homer: The Iliad*, trans. by R. Fitzgerald (Oxford).
 Kirk, G. 1985. *The Iliad: a Commentary. Vol.1: Books 1-4* (Cambridge).
 Masson, D.J. 1967. 'Vowel and consonant patterns in poetry', in S. Chatman and S.R. Levin (eds.), *Essays in the Language of Literature* (Boston).
 Ong, W.J. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: the Technologizing of the Word* (London and New York).
 Palmer-Sikelianou, E. 1943. 'The poet Anghelos Sikelianos', *Athene* (New York), vol.4, no.9: 23-7.
 Paraschos, K. 1937. *Δέκα Έλληνες λυρικοί* (Athens).
 Seferis, G. 1974. *Δοκιμές*, II (Athens).
 Sikelianos, A. 1944. 'Πώς βλέπω τόν 'Υπερρεαλισμό', *Τά νέα γράμματα* 7: 247-53.
 Sikelianou, A. 1985. *Η ζωή μου μέ τόν 'Αγγελο* (Athens).
 Venezis, E. 1952. 'Η γή, ή μνήμη, ή ποίηση', *Νέα Έστία*, Christmas 1952: 4-5.
 Vitti, M. 1979. *Η Γενιά του Τριάντα: ιδεολογία καί μορφή* (Athens).
 Xydis, T. 1979. *Άγγελος Σικελιανός* (Athens).

The Aleppo question: a Byzantine-Fatimid conflict of interests in Northern Syria in the later tenth century A.D.*

WESAM FARAG

The ambition to control Syria had always been among the serious temptations of Emperor Nikephoros Phokas (963-969). In the last year of his reign and specifically on October 28th, 969 A.D. two of his generals, Michael Bourtzes and Peter Phokas (the *Stratopedarch*), at last succeeded in capturing the great city of Antioch.¹ For the first time in three centuries Byzantium re-established its authority in Northern Syria, and soon Antioch became a seat of a *doux* whose responsibility was to guard the southeastern flank of the Empire. Like both the *doux* of Mesopotamia and that of Chaldia, the *doux* of Antioch had to supervise the small themes in the new Byzantine territories which came under his jurisdiction.² Moreover, as a stronghold Antioch

* This article is based on a paper given at the Third International Congress of Greek and Arabic Studies, held in Athens, July 1988. I wish to thank the participants for their helpful comments.

The study represents also part of a project undertaken during tenure of an Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung Fellowship at the Byzantinisch-Neugriechisches Seminar der Freien Universität Berlin, 1983-1984. I should like to thank the AvH foundation for its generous support.

1. On the conquest of Antioch, see *Leo Diaconus (Leonis Diaconi Caloensis Historiae libri decem et liber De Velitatione Bellica Nicephori Augusti)*, ed. C.B. Hase [CSHB Bonn 1828] 81-82; *Scylitzes (Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis Historiarum)*, ed. J. Thurn [CFHB 5, Berlin/New York 1973] 271-73; *Yahya of Antioch (Histoire de Yahya ibn Sa'id d'Antioche. Continuateur de Sa'id ibn Bitriq)*, edd. and trans. I. Kratchkovsky and A. Vasiliev [PO XVIII, XXIII, Paris 1924-32] 822-23; *Kamāl al-Dīn (Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-Adīm, Zubdat al-Halab Min Tarīkh Halab)*, ed. S. Dahan [Damascus 1951, 1954].

2. N. Oikonomidēs, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX^e-X^e siècles* (Paris 1972) 344-45. Ibn Zāfir gives in his account an indication that the *doux* of Antioch was in

was to serve as the main Byzantine headquarters in all military operations in Syria for years to come.

On the southern shores of the Mediterranean the Fatimids moved east and seized Egypt in that same year 969. From Egypt they moved quickly to Palestine and Syria where they inherited the possessions of the Ikhshidids, the previous rulers of Egypt and Palestine.³ Moreover, in the East, the court of Baghdad enjoyed a temporary revival of strength under the powerful Buyid Emir ʿAdud al-Daulah (978-983). His conquest of the Hamdanid Emirate of Mosul in 979 deprived its Emir Abū Taghlib from all his possessions and put the whole of *al-Jazīrah* under the firm control of his court at Baghdad.⁴

Now, geographically Aleppo was surrounded by greater powers who were alert and eager to capture, or put it under their suzerainty. This circumstance brought into being what one might call 'the Aleppo Question', which was to dominate the eastern policy of Emperor Basil II (976-1025) and his relations with the Fatimids in particular.

The advance of the Byzantine general Peter Phokas against Aleppo was an inevitable consequence of the conquest of Antioch, for it goes without saying that if the Byzantine authority in northern Syria was to be on firm ground Aleppo had to be secured. The Byzantine siege of Aleppo lasted 27 days, during which negotiations took place. The chamberlain Qarghawaih and his deputy Bakgūr eventually decided to accept Peter's truce proposals in order to save the city from complete disaster. Although the text of this truce, which was concluded in Safar A.H. 359/December 969-January 970 A.D., has been indirectly preserved in the works of Kamāl al-Dīn, the Arabian historian of the thir-

charge of all '*al-Thughūr*' (i.e. the Arab-Byzantine frontier zone), cf. *Ibn Zāfir* (MS) (Ibn Zāfir, *Kitāb Akhbār al-Duwal al-Munqatiʿa*, BM MS. Or 3685), fol.19V.

3. On the Fatimid conquest of Egypt and their early advance on Syria, see Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 818-21; and 350-51; Maqrīzī (Al-Maqrīzī, *Itf'āz al-Hunafā bi Akhbār al-A'imah al-Fatimiyyin al-Khulafā*, ed. J. al-Shayyāl, M.H.M. Ahmad [Cairo 1967, 1971]) I. 97-127.

4. Miskawaih (Abū Ali Miskawaih, *Kitāb Tajārib al-'Umam*, last section ed. H.F. Amedroz [Cairo 1914, 1915]) II, 382-95; *The Eclipse (The Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate. Original Chronicles of the Fourth Islamic Century*, trans. H.F. Amedroz, D.S. Margoliouth [Oxford 1920-1921]) V, 420-34; Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire* 397, 399. Cf. *Ibn Zāfir* (MS), fol.15r.

teenth century,⁵ we know very little about the process by which it was evolved and ratified. All that we do know is that the pact was supported by the oath of native Sheikhs and was guaranteed by the delivery of certain hostages to the Byzantines, but it is very probable that documents were exchanged,⁶ which would explain how certain terms were re-negotiated in 981, and again in 986.

The truce is of central importance for the development of Byzantine-Muslim relations. It carefully differentiates between the boundaries and names of the Syrian territories ceded to, and incorporated in, the Byzantine Empire, and those over which the Byzantine Emperor was to become suzerain.⁷ The Emirate of Aleppo with its remaining territories east of the Orontes — the land of the truce — was reduced to a state of vassalage. This truce which, it was hoped would be perpetual, comprised provisions reflecting the obligations of Aleppo towards the Empire and regularizing aspects of the relationship. The Byzantine Empire now had its footholds in northern Syria, and Aleppo had henceforth to protect this Byzantine presence, acting as an advanced post to guard Byzantine interests and to warn the imperial administration of any imminent menace from the south.

The conquest of Egypt was soon to involve the Fatimids in the politics of Syria. Fatimid policy towards Syria can be explained in two ways. Firstly, any power centred in Egypt could not be indifferent to Syria. The geographical structure of Egypt left her north-eastern frontier vulnerable and open to easy invasion. This fact is obvious, either in ancient, medieval, or, even modern history. To overcome this potential danger, it was a tradition in the foreign policy of independent Egypt to capture Syria or part of it and use it as a buffer. Before invaders could reach Egypt,

5. Kamāl al-Dīn, *Zubdat* (cited note 1 above) I. 163-68; cf. G. Freytag, *Regnum Saahd-Aldaulae in Oppido Helebo* (Regierung des Saahd-Aldaula zu Aleppo [Übersetzt und durch Anmerkungen erklärt von G. Freytag] Bonn 1820) 7-11; see the latin trans. at *Leo Diaconus* (cited note 1 above) 391-94; cf. French transl. in M. Canard, *Histoire de la dynastie des Hamdanides de Jazira et de Syrie* (Paris 1953) I, 833-36; English trans. in W. Farag, 'The Truce of Safar A.H. 359/December-January 969-970 A.D.', (Birmingham 1977) 1-8.

6. According to Ibn Zāfir a well-known document was written and exchanged, see *Ibn Zāfir (MS)*, Fol. 18r.

7. Kamāl al Dīn, *Zubdat*, I, 164-65; Farag, *The Truce* (cited note 5 above) 2.

they would then be met by Egyptian troops away from Egypt. This policy was soon adopted by the Fatimids.⁸

Secondly, the doctrine of the Fatimid caliphate and its efficient propaganda made it clear that the Fatimids aimed at the capture of the world as they conceived of it. Although their propaganda was directed against the Umayyads of Spain, the Byzantine Empire and the Abbasid Caliphate, it was against the Abbasides — since the conquest of Egypt — that their propaganda was most intense.⁹ On the other hand the court of Baghdad considering itself the sole Caliphate of all Muslims, never forgave the establishment of the Fatimids and initiated psychological as well as military programmes against the Fatimids.¹⁰ In fact at that time the Fatimids did not regard the Byzantine Empire as their first enemy and all their previous propaganda against the Byzantines was for public consumption.

Since the Fatimid conquest of Egypt in 969 and their subsequent emergence in Syria, Byzantium had tried to maintain ties of good relationship with the new power in Egypt. In June 974, an ambassador from Byzantium arrived in Cairo. The exact nature of the message he carried is not reported, although he spoke to the Caliph about a truce and presented a letter to him.¹¹ However, the Byzantine envoy died soon after and Caliph al-Mu'izz sent him home in a coffin.¹² Whether or not the death of the Greek envoy in Cairo contributed to the motives behind

8. B. Lewis 'Egypt and Syria to the end of the Fatimid Caliphate', *CHI* 1 (1970) 191-92.

9. M. Canard, 'L'Impérialisme des Fatimides et leur Propaganda', *AIEO* 6 (1942-47) 162 and 169-85.

10. On the hostilities of the court of Baghdad, see *Ibn al-Qalānīsī* (Ibn al-Qalānīsī, *Ḍhayl Tārīkh Dimashq* 363-555 A.H., ed. H.F. Amedroz (Leiden 1908) 23 and 24, note 1; *Ibn Zāfir (Ferre)* (Ibn Zāfir, *Akhbar al-Duwal al-Munqati'a*, ed. A. Ferre [Paris 1971]) 34-35 (this edition deals only with the section concerning the Fatimids). See also Maqrīzī, *Ittī'āz* (cited n.3 above) I, 252; *Ibn al-Dawādārī* (*Die Chronik des Ibn al-Dawādārī VI: Der Bericht über die Fatimiden*, ed. S. al-Munajjid [Cairo 1961]) VI, 195 and 203 (= Deutsches archäol. Inst. Kairo. Quellen zur Geschichte des Islam. Ägyptens, li. Cf. F. Wüstenfeld, *Geschichte der Fatimiden Califen, nach Arabischen Quellen* (Göttingen 1881) 142-44.

11. Maqrīzī, *Ittī'āz*, I, 208-209. On the presents received by the Caliph, see *Ibn al-Zubair* (al-Qādī Ibn al-Zubair, *Kitāb al-Dhakhā'ir wa al-Tuhaf*, ed. M. Hamid Allah [Kuwait 1959]) 82.

12. Maqrīzī, *Ittī'āz*, I, 214. Cf. P.E. Walker, 'The "Crusade" of John Tzimiskes in the light of new Arabic evidence', *B* 47 (1977) 313-14.

John Tzimiskēs' campaign against Syria in the following year, it remains evident that Constantinople tried to establish amicable relations with Cairo even before the reign of Basil II.¹³

However, despite the preoccupation of Emperor Basil II with internal problems, he did not underestimate the significance of re-establishing Byzantine-Fatimid entente. The Emperor had cause to regard the establishment of the Fatimid Caliphate in Egypt and Syria favourably, for the Fatimids opposed the Abbasids who supported Bardas Skleros and wished to see him on the imperial throne. Moreover, Basil II tried to keep his eastern front quiet during his forthcoming preoccupation with Bulgaria. Insofar as the Fatimids could distract the court of Baghdad, Fatimid friendship was to be desired.

In 987 a Byzantine embassy arrived in Egypt by sea, bringing many presents and delivering a letter from the Emperor. In this letter Basil II proposed a treaty with the Fatimid Caliph al-ʿAzīz; the Caliph agreed, and a seven-year truce was concluded.¹⁴

The fact that Basil II and al-ʿAzīz came to terms in 987 indicates at least that Cairo too desired the truce. The difficult conditions in Syria, which did not submit to the Fatimids without struggle, compelled the Fatimid Caliphate to modify its theoretical policy and to arrive at a more realistic and practical one. It is impossible to say that Syria was ever solidly a Fatimid possession. War was waged almost without interruption, especially during the reigns of al-ʿAzīz and al-Hākīm. The Fatimids tried in vain to pacify and dominate this region and to hold it against petty local rulers, recalcitrant cities, belligerent sects, and

13. In the very year of al-Muʿizz' death (365 A.h./A.D.975) he received another embassy from John Tzimiskēs, see Maqrizi, *Itf'āz*, I, 225.

14. *Dhahabī (Ms)* (Al-Dhahabī, *Tārīkh al-Islām*, BM Mss Or. 48-53), Fols. 16 r-v; *Ibn Taghribirdī* (Abu al-Māhsin Ibn Taghribirdī, *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhira fī Mulūk Misr Wa-l-Qāhira*, ed. A.Z. Al-ʿAdawi (Cairo 1348/1929-1355/1936) IV, 151-52. Cf. F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches von 565-1453* (Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der Neueren Zeit. Reihe A: Regesten Abteilung I) (München-Berlin 1924-1965) I. No. 770; V.R. Rozen, *Imperator Vasilij Bolgarobojca, Izvlecenija iz Letopisi Jaxi Antioxijskago* (repr. London 1970) 202-207 note 158.

rapacious Bedouin chieftains, the latter being the most terrible scourge for the sedentary population.¹⁵

Nevertheless, the Byzantine-Fatimid entente, was short lived because the factors which promoted it simply ceased to exist in the last decade of the tenth century. The Buyid Emir ʿAdud al-Daulah died in 983 and his death ended the short lived Buyid revival in Baghdad, brought the fragmentation of power once more into effect, and certainly relieved the Fatimids in Egypt.¹⁶ Six years later Basil II managed to bring the second rebellion of Bardas Skleros to a peaceful end. Moreover, the Fatimids managed — after early reverses and not without difficulties — to control Palestine and central Syria, thus posing a serious threat to the Byzantine possessions and interests in northern Syria.

Although the Fatimids had no genuine desire to confront the Empire as a target in itself, their policy towards Syria — which had to be secured — aroused the desire to capture Aleppo, and to acquire more territory. On several occasions when Fatimid Egypt felt sufficiently strong to enforce order and effectively control over southern and central Syria, its eyes turned towards the North and its armies attempted the capture of Aleppo. This ambitious policy could be justified within Fatimid imperial theory, for which efficient propaganda was necessary. It aimed — among other things — at bringing the Abbasid Caliphate to an end. Aleppo, however, was a doorway to Iraq,¹⁷ and if anyone should capture it all the countries beyond it would be in his hands.¹⁸ But Aleppo was also a doorway to the Byzantine footholds and possessions in northern Syria. Its strategic position on the caravan route linking Asia Minor and Armenia with Syria, Iraq and central Asia, was obvious to Byzantium.

It is further of interest to notice that Aleppo, on account of its geo-political situation, surrounded by greater powers, had no

15. See Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire* (cited note 1 above) 411, 505-506; *Ibn al-Qalanisi* (cited note 10 above) 23, 24 and 31; Maqrizi, *Ittīʿāz* I, 254-55; II, 87.

16. *Ibn al-Qalānisi*, 24.

17. *Ibn Hauqal* (Ibn Hauqal, *Kitāb Surat al-ʿArd*, ed. J.H. Kramers [*BGA* II, Leiden 1938-39]) 177. Cf. *Istakhṛī* (Al-Istakhṛī, *Masalik al-Mamalik* ed. M.J. De Goeje [*BGA* I, Leiden 1927]) 61.

18. *Ibn al-Qalānisi*, 34.

policy towards the Byzantine Empire or even towards the Fatimid Caliphate. But there was always a reaction to the events of the time. The circumstances prevailing in Aleppo and the numerous nomadic elements in its hinterland encouraged an attitude of independence, yet this attitude was rather flexible.

With the Fatimid presence in central Syria, however, the status of Aleppo as defined in the 'Truce of Safar' was not only enhanced but also altered. The proximity of two strong powers to the Emirate of Aleppo changed its status from a straightforward vassalage to the Empire, to that of a buffer principality between the Empire and the Fatimids. This new status prevailed in Aleppo in the late tenth and throughout a good deal of the eleventh century. Almost none of the rulers of Aleppo (the late Hamdanids, the post-Hamdanids, and the Mirdasid Emirs) observed full loyalty to either of the two powers bordering their domains. They all took into account the Aleppo question, in terms of the conflicting interests of Byzantium and the Fatimid Caliphate and manoeuvred accordingly between the two courts in Constantinople and Cairo seeking to exploit matters to their own advantage.

In the last decade of the tenth century, the Byzantine Empire resented and resisted the existence on its immediate borders of any strong Muslim power. Aleppo itself was not a Byzantine target for annexation, yet Byzantium preferred to see and protect a quasi-independent entity in Aleppo. The preservation of such rule in Aleppo would serve imperial interests better, for such a small and weak entity would be useful as a buffer, link, or bridge, to the Muslim world, a free international market and a deterrent to Muslim movements, checking them from raiding Byzantine territories.

But the Fatimids challenged this policy. Serious Fatimid attempts to seize Aleppo often followed their campaigns to bring Damascus and central Syria under effective control. Nevertheless, it was inevitable that the two great powers, Byzantium and the Fatimids, should clash, and indeed they did, because of the conflict of interests between them over the Aleppo region.

Although Emperor Basil II used the full resources of the Empire, and turned his own considerable military talents to Bulgarian affairs, he never lost sight of his obligations towards

Syria. His policy was to keep what he had there, but little more. He would not tolerate a Fatimid takeover of Aleppo. The Fatimid campaign of 992 against Aleppo and the raids against Antioch and other Byzantine footholds in northern Syria,¹⁹ which were marked by ruin and devastation, shook Byzantine-Fatimid relations and indeed broke their seven year truce of 987. Basil II regarded the aggressive policy of the Fatimids with concern. It is true that he sent reinforcements to Antioch under the command of his able general the Magistros Leo Melissenos,²⁰ but this did not satisfy him. New evidence shows that Basil II ordered a naval operation against Alexandria. The Egyptian historian al-Maqrizi reports a battle with a Byzantine maritime squadron off Alexandria, probably in May 993, and the capture of 70 Greeks. He also reports that the Byzantines were forced to set sail towards the Syrian coast and that they were chased by the Egyptian ships.²¹ It seems that what happened was an attempt by Basil II to hamper Fatimid preparations in central Syria by cutting their supplies from reaching Tripoli. This incident did not deter the Caliph from going ahead with his plans to capture Aleppo.

In the spring of 994 the Fatimid forces in Syria were well prepared and well supplied to undertake another attempt against Aleppo. The siege of Aleppo involved the Fatimids in a serious confrontation with the *doux* of Antioch who came out to rescue Aleppo. This battle, which is called that of the 'Ford' and which took place on the 15th of September 994 in the region between Antioch and Aleppo, left 5000 Greeks dead, and Michael Bourtzes and Leo Melissenos were consequently forced to retire to Antioch.²² This victory enabled the Fatimids to capture the fortress of 'Azaz and to take effective possession of almost the

19. On this campaign see: Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 436-39; Kamāl al-Dīn, *Zubdat* (cited note 1 above) I, 185-88; *Ibn al-Qalānisi*, 41-42; Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, I 269-76; Canard, *Histoire* (cited note 5 above) I, 698-700.

20. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 440. Cf. *Ibn Zāfir (Ms)* (cited note 2 above) fols. 23r-v; Canard, *Histoire*, I, 856; Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches von 363-1071* (Brussels 1935) 106; G. Schlumberger, *L'Épopée byzantine à la fin du dixième siècle* (Paris 1896-1905) II, 80.

21. Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, I, 277, 278.

22. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 440-41; Kamāl al-Dīn, *Zubdat*, I, 189-90; Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, I, 281.

entire region of Aleppo.²³ The Fatimids turned once more to the city of Aleppo itself and resumed the siege. The strength of Fatimid determination to capture Aleppo could be seen in the fortified village — with baths and bazaars — which they built in front of the walls of the city to lodge their troops during the winter.²⁴ The remnants of this village were still visible in the thirteenth century when Kamāl al-Dīn wrote his history of Aleppo.²⁵

The siege of Aleppo dragged on for months. Consequently famine resulted, and plague, as usual, followed in its steps, adding to the misery of the people.²⁶ The Emir of Aleppo despatched an envoy to Basil II, who was still campaigning in the heart of the Bulgar country, to solicit help.²⁷ The Emperor knew well that the situation in northern Syria was critical. With the Fatimid encroachments upon northern Syria, not only was Aleppo on the brink of surrender, but Antioch and the rest of his possessions on the southern flank of the Empire were seriously endangered. With the failure of his *doux* of Antioch, there was need of his presence. He, therefore, had no alternative but to transfer his operations to Syria. That Basil turned his attention to Syria in earnest, can be seen in his hurrying with part of his army to Antioch. It is further of interest to notice that his army included Greek, Russian, Bulgarian and Georgian contingents.²⁸ Basil travelled three hundred parasangs, crossing the whole of Asia Minor in a few weeks, to take the Fatimids by surprise. He arrived at Antioch in April 995.²⁹

The appearance of the Emperor and the withdrawal of the Fatimid army southwards in disorder had both social and

23. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 441; Kamāl al-Dīn, *Zubdat*, I, 190. Cf. Honigmann, *Ostgrenze*, 106; Canard, *Histoire*, I, 703.

24. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 441; *Ibn al-Qalānisi*, 42; Schlumberger, *L'Épopée*, II, 84.

25. Kamāl al-Dīn, *Zubdat*, I, 190.

26. *Ibn al-Qalānisi*, 42-43; Abu *Shujā'* (Abu *Shujā'* Rudhrāwārī, *Dhail Tajārib al-'Umam*, ed. H.F. Amedroz [Cairo 1916]) 220; *The Eclipse* (cited note 4 above), VI, 232.

27. Abu *Shujā'*, 220; *The Eclipse*, VI, 232; *Ibn al-Qalānisi*, 43; Kamāl al-Dīn, *Zubdat*, I, 190; Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 442. Cf. Canard, *Histoire*, I, 704.

28. *Ibn al-Qalānisi*, 43.

29. In the month of Rabī' I (= 5 April-4 May 994 A.D.), cf. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 442.

economic repercussion in Syria. New evidence shows that the inhabitants of cities and villages, from Damascus to Aleppo, were alarmed and suspecting that the Emperor would give chase to the Fatimids, they left their houses and fields, though it was harvest season, and fled in confusion. Provisions consequently became scarce and prices went up.³⁰ The confusion of the Syrian population, and their fear of the Greeks, was augmented by the plundering of deserting Fatimid troops who contributed to their hardship more than the Greeks.³¹

If one carefully examines the course of Basil's first Syrian campaign, one will notice that the campaign did not gain decisive results.³² The Emperor had no inclination towards territorial expansion in Syria, but he was persistent in keeping and consolidating what he possessed. It has been reported that Constantine, the brother of the Emperor, who accompanied him to Syria, tried to persuade him to take Aleppo and annex it to the Empire, but the Emperor rejected the idea.³³ In his view Aleppo could serve the Empire better as a buffer under imperial suzerainty. That Basil repulsed the Fatimids, rescued Aleppo, and removed the danger threatening Antioch, is certainly true; but he did not end the Fatimid danger altogether. His successful march on Aphamiya, Shaizer, Homs and Rafaniya does not mean that these interior localities came under Byzantine control. In fact the Emperor did not aim at such. He desired to push the Fatimids out of the 'land of the truce' to enable the Emir of Aleppo to take full control of his region.

With Tripoli the case was different. He aimed at capturing that city and, by putting it under his firm control, to deprive the Fatimids of their strategic base on the Syrian coast. Unlike the maintenance of localities in the interior, that of a well fortified port was neither difficult nor costly. But his efforts in this respect were badly frustrated. Therefore, he turned to Tortosa which was

30. Maqrīzī, *Ittī'āz*, I, 286.

31. *Ibn al Dawādārī* (cited note 10 above) VI, 237.

32. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 442-43; Kamāl al-Dīn, *Zubdat*, I, 191; *Ibn al-Qalānisi*, 43-44; *Ibn Taghrībirdī* (cited note 14 above) IV, 120-21; cf. Honigmann, *Ostgrenze*, 106; Canard, *Histoire*, I, 705 and 858-59.

33. Kamāl al-Dīn, *Zubdat*, I, 191.

in ruins, fortified it, and installed a strong garrison.³⁴ As a port to the north of Tripoli, Tortosa could challenge Fatimid naval activity off the Syrian coast.

Although, the Byzantine-Fatimid contest over northern Syria increased the rift between Cairo and Constantinople, it did not change the map of Syria dramatically. The first campaign of Basil II consolidated imperial possessions and slightly enlarged them. The Empire possessed the northern part of the Syrian coast, from Alexandretta to Tortosa, with the exception of Maraḡiya, which was still under Fatimid control. As to the Fatimids, despite their attempts to capture Aleppo, their power barely extended as far as Tripoli. The southern part of the Emirate of Aleppo was open to all. After Basil's campaign, neither the *doux* of Antioch nor the Emir of Aleppo could hold localities such as Aphamiya, Kafriāb, Shaizer, Hama, Rafaniya and Homs, against Fatimid counter-attack, and one might say that the power of the Emir of Aleppo hardly extended to the south of Ma'arat al-Nu'man.³⁵ But, when the Emperor left Syria in the autumn of 995, he left behind a well organized military administration in Antioch. Michael Bourtzes was dismissed from his office as *doux* of Antioch and replaced by Damianos Dalassenos,³⁶ with instructions to focus attention on the region of Tripoli, putting strain on the Fatimids and thus hindering them from resuming any march north.

The death of the Fatimid Caliph al-ʿAziz and the accession of his son al-Ḥākim, in October 996, was followed in Syria by a period of disorder. In Palestine, the Bedouin chief Mufarrij b. al-Jarrāh broke out in revolt, established his headquarters at

34. According to al-Maqrīzī, *Ittīfāz*, I, 286, the garrison was of 4,000 men. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 443, reports that it consisted mainly of Armenians, while *Ibn Zāfir (Ms.)* Fol. 24r, points out that the Emperor installed a force of his troops with some Muslims from the Mountain of b. Mas'ūd. Cf. Schlumberger, *L'Épopée*, II, 95f., Honigmann, *Ostgrenze*, 106; Canard, *Histoire*, I, 858.

35. Even Ma'arat al-Nu'mān was not always under the power of the Hamdanid Emir. According to Kamāl al-Dīn, *Zubdat*, I, 192, in the year 386 A.H./A.D. 996, the governor of Ma'arat al-Nu'mān rebelled against his master and joined the Fatimids.

36. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 443-44; V. Laurent, 'La chronologie des gouverneurs d'Antioche sous la seconde domination byzantine (969-1084)', *MéUSJ* 38 (1962) 234; Honigmann, *Ostgrenze*, 106. Cf. Schlumberger, *L'Épopée*, II, 97.

Ramle, and made forays in the Bedouin fashion through the surrounding country.³⁷ Another fairly serious uprising started in Tyre under the leadership of the adventurer ʿAllāqah. Meanwhile, the *doux* of Antioch continued the recommended offensive policy against the Fatimids. He marched on Aphamiya which he besieged.³⁸

The rebellion of Tyre was serious. The adventurer ʿAllāqah, who took up arms against the new Fatimid administration, appealed to the Byzantine Emperor for his support. He promised, in return, to deliver Tyre to the Emperor. Surprisingly, the Emperor responded positively by sending a maritime squadron to the rebel.³⁹ Byzantine involvement in the revolt of Tyre raises the question of the motives behind it. Was Byzantium at that time seeking a foothold on the southern Syrian coast to cut the routes of the Fatimid navy in the east Mediterranean? Or was the Emperor trying to keep the Fatimids preoccupied with their internal troubles and to render them unable to march north? One cannot be certain, and there is still speculation over the issue. But it is conceivable that the two powers were contending about the overlordship of the Syrian coast.

The civil disturbances in Damascus augmented the effective loss of Fatimid control over Syria.⁴⁰ But the Fatimids had no intention of losing hold of Syria permanently. At the head of a large force, the Fatimid general Jaish b. Samsāmah marched first on Ramle and managed to regain control over Palestine. In the meantime he sent a detachment of his force against Tyre. But the main Fatimid assault against Tyre was from the sea. A maritime squadron of 20 ships was sent from Egypt against the city, while instructions were also given to the provincial fleets based in Tripoli and Sidon to set sail. Affairs in Tyre ended successfully with the

37. *Ibn al-Qalānisi*, 50; *Abu Shujāʿ* (cited note 26 above) 226; *The Eclipse* (cited note 4 above) VI, 238; *Ibn al-Athīr* (*Ibn al-Athīr*, *Kitāb al-kāmil fi al-Tāʾrikh* [Cairo 1303 A.H.]) IX, 41. Cf. Wüstenfeld, *Fatimiden* (cited note 10 above) 170.

38. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 455-56. Cf. *Ibn al-Qalānisi*, 50-1; *Abu Shujāʿ*, 226; *The Eclipse* VI, 238; Schlumberger, *L'Épopée*, II, 108 F.

39. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 454; *Ibn al-Qalānisi*, 50; Maqrīzī, *Ittiʿāz*, II, 18; *Ibn al-Athīr*, IX, 41.

40. *Ibn al-Qalānisi*, 49-50; *Abu Shujāʿ*, 225-26; *The Eclipse*, VI, 237-38. Cf. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 454; Wüstenfeld, *Fatimiden*, 169.

defeat of the Byzantine maritime squadron off the city in June 998.⁴¹

Having brought Damascus under effective control, the Fatimid general advanced north to deal effectually with the *doux* of Antioch, whose siege of Aphamiya had been growing serious.⁴² The Fatimid camp was joined by an auxiliary force of the Bedouins of Banū Kilāb who, according to their practice, took part in almost every battle fought in northern Syria, in the tenth century, for their own benefit. The battle of Aphamiya, which was fought on 19 July 998, resulted in immense loss for Byzantium. The Byzantine thematic battalion of Antioch — in charge of guarding the south eastern flank of the Empire — was almost annihilated and the *doux* of Antioch was killed.⁴³ Once more the imperial possessions in northern Syria were endangered. The Fatimids marched unopposed into the open region of Antioch instead of Aleppo. They penetrated as far as Germanikeia.⁴⁴ But the Fatimids, though returned to Damascus (probably in October 998), repeatedly raided the region of Antioch causing much damage.

The question of north Syria again appeared serious, and Basil once more had to rescue Antioch and secure the southern flank of his Empire. He saw that it would be necessary to repeat the lesson administered four years before. In September 999 the Emperor arrived in Syria,⁴⁵ at the head of an army which included the invincible Russian troops of his household, in circumstances more or less similar to those of 995. He marched on Aphamiya, Shaizer, Rafaniya and Homs, burning and plundering the Syrian valley. During his stay in the citadel of Shaizer,

41. The Fatimids captured one Byzantine ship and killed over a hundred Greeks; Cf. *Ibn al Qalānisi*, 50; Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 455.

42. *Ibn al-Qalānisi*, 51; *Abu Shujā'*, 227; *The Eclipse*, VI, 240. Cf. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 456.

43. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 456: six thousand Greeks were killed. See the different figures in *Ibn al Qalānisi*, 52; Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, II, 19; *Bar Hebraeus (The Chronography of Gregory Abū 'l-Faraj*, trans. E.A.W. Budge [London 1932]) I, 181. The Greek chronicler Skylitzes reports the event, but not without confusion, see *Scylitzes* (cited note 1 above) 340.

44. Maqrīzī, *Itti'āz*, II, 19.

45. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 457. Cf. Schlumberger, *L'Épopée*, II, 150.

the Emperor received the homage of Saʿid al-Daulah the Hamdanid Emir of Aleppo.⁴⁶ The Emperor was able to advance still further south till he approached Baalbeck, when he turned back by the coast. On his way back he turned against Tripoli on the 6th of December 999. He made an attempt against the citadel on the 9th of December, but all his efforts were once more frustrated. On the 17th of December the Emperor threw up the siege, and retreated to Antioch.⁴⁷ In Antioch, the Byzantine administration was reorganized and Nikephoros Ouranos, who in 979 and again in 983 was the Emperor's envoy to Baghdad and in 996 had distinguished himself in the Bulgarian war, was appointed *Katepano* of Antioch.⁴⁸

The strategy of Basil II's second campaign was to restore the status quo in Syria and to compel the Fatimids by his great show of strength to conclude a truce. It is likely that when the Emperor left Antioch in January 1000 for winter quarters in Cilicia, he intended to come back to Syria if the proposed peace was rejected. Hard evidence shows that the Emperor had sent two envoys to the Fatimid court on the eve of his Syrian campaign to negotiate peace. The first one was dismissed, but the other one was delayed in Cairo waiting for the Fatimid reply. When the envoy heard the news of the Emperor's campaign, he became terrified and asked for permission to leave, but his request was politely rejected. Only when the departure of the Emperor was reported, did the Fatimids agree to conclude a truce.⁴⁹

Aristos the patriarch of Jerusalem, the maternal uncle of the Caliph al-Ḥākim,⁵⁰ was sent to Byzantium with the Greek envoy with this aim in mind.⁵¹ But it was in the following year

46. Kamāl al-Dīn, *Zubdat*, I, 192.

47. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 459; Maqrīzī, *Ittīʿāz*, II, 32; Cf. Schlumberger, *L'Épopée*, II, 155-57; Honigmann, *Ostgrenze*, 107, 108.

48. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 459-60. Cf. Scylitzes, 345; Laurent, *Antioche* (cited note 36 above) 235-36.

49. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 460-1.

50. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 415; *Lives of the Patriarchs of Alexandria (MS) (Lives of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, from the first St. Mark the Apostle to Matthew the 87th)*, BM MS. Or 1338) fols. 231r-v.

51. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 461.

1001, that a ten year truce was concluded between the Byzantine Empire and the Fatimid Caliphate.⁵²

Unfortunately, the text of this truce did not survive and we are therefore, ignorant of its details. But hard evidence shows that on the 12th of May 1001 a Byzantine envoy arrived in Cairo and was received in a formal audience by the Fatimid Caliph al-Hakim.⁵³ Nevertheless, there is every reason to believe that the Greek envoy delivered the Caliph a copy of the pact that had been agreed upon for ratification. It is reported that the patriarch of Jerusalem having concluded the truce, stayed in Constantinople where he died four years later.⁵⁴

The truce of 1001 seems in effect to have demonstrated the limits of Byzantine reconquest. The Katepanate of Antioch was slightly enlarged and recognized as an imperial possession, and a rather shadowy suzerainty over Aleppo was admitted, south of which Fatimid sovereignty was acknowledged.

The Fatimid attempts to take possession of the Emirate of Aleppo had failed. It was the Byzantine policy to keep Aleppo out of Fatimid reach, that frustrated the Caliph's plans. In this respect Emperor Basil II employed both diplomacy and force. Therefore, it was in northern Syria that the influence of Cairo and Constantinople met and clashed. The region of Aleppo was the battle ground for their struggle, and consequently it was Aleppo which paid most. Its territory was overrun by Berber and Greek forces, its fields were desolated and its population suffered misery. Under such circumstances the ruling Hamdanids of Aleppo, who once had a formidable appearance, grew weaker, and soon declined, allowing Bedouin elements in the region to rise and become dominant in the eleventh century.

The state of non-belligerence between Cairo and Constantinople, however, did not last long. In 1016 Byzantine-Fatimid rela-

52. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 461. Cf. *Ibn al Qalānisi*, 54; *Abu Shujā'*, 230; *The Eclipse*, VI, 243; *Ibn al Athīr* (Cited note 37 above) IX, 42.

53. See the description of the audience given to the Greek envoy, in Maqrīzī, *Itfāz*, II, 39-40. Cf. *Ibn al-Zubair* (Cited note 11 above) 150-51.

54. Yahya of Antioch, *Histoire*, 461. Cf. Schlumberger, *L'Épopée*, II, 208; W. Felix, *Byzanz und die islamische Welt im früheren 11. Jahrhundert. Geschichte der politischen Beziehungen von 1001 bis 1055*. [Byzantina Vindobonensia 14] (Wien, Österr. Akad. d. Wiss. 1981) 49 note 14.

tions deteriorated to an extent that the Emperor — while still in the Balkans trampling the last sparks of Bulgaria's resistance — prohibited travel and commerce from the whole Byzantine Empire to any part of Syria and Egypt.⁵⁵ It has been wrongly assumed that these commercial weapons were used against the Fatimid Caliph al-Hakim because he had unleashed his notorious persecution of Christians and ordered the demolition of the church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem.⁵⁶ The evidence available, demonstrates that the demolition of the Holy Sepulchre (in 1009) produced, in fact, little reaction on the part of Basil II, and that the Byzantine-Fatimid years of non-belligerence were not disturbed until 1016.⁵⁷ The Emperor's act, in fact, was based on chiefly political grounds, involving the Aleppo question.

Despite their previous failures, the annexation of Aleppo remained for the Fatimids a cherished ambition. Now they changed their tactics and took advantage of the Bedouin (Banu Kilab) uprising against the ruler of Aleppo. Instead of employing force to achieve their ends, they started a steady infiltration of the Emirate of Aleppo, showering money and rewards on the contesting parties and managed suddenly, though temporarily, to take over Aleppo in 1016. This was a blow to Basil II and his policy and certainly took him by surprise.

The Emperor used commercial tactics to keep Aleppo within his sphere of influence. The Bedouin tribe of Banū Kilāb was exempted,⁵⁸ and from that moment their chief Sālih b. Mirdās was given the Emperor's blessing and support until he eventually managed to capture the city and the citadel of Aleppo and established the Mirdasid dynasty in 1025.⁵⁹ As for the rest of Syria and Egypt, it is almost certain that the Emperor continued

55. Yahya of Antioch (*Tā'riḫ Yahya ibn Sa'īd al-Antakī*, ed. L. Cheikho, complete text to 426 A.H./A.D. 1034 [Beirut 1909]) 214.

56. Cf. M. Canard, Art. 'Fatimids', *EI²*, cols. 850-62; M. Canard, 'La destruction de l'Église de la Résurrection par le Calife Hakim', *B* 35 (1965) 16-43; R. S. Lopez, 'Silk Industry in the Byzantine Empire', *Speculum* 20 (1945) 31, note 1.

57. Felix, *Byzanz und die islamische Welt* (cited note 54 above) 59, 68.

58. Yahya of Antioch, *Tā'riḫ*, 214; Felix, *Byzanz und die islamische Welt*, 68.

59. Cf. Kamāl al-Dīn, *Zubdat*, I, 227-30; Yahya of Antioch, *Tā'riḫ*, 245-48; Felix, *Byzanz und die islamische Welt*, 77-79.

his commercial blockade until the end of his reign.⁶⁰ There is no evidence to prove otherwise in the documents published so far from the Cairo Geniza. Only a few years after Basil's reign and throughout the eleventh century one reads, in the Geniza records once again, of Rumi ships and Rūmi people visiting with equal frequency the Fatimid domains in Syria, Egypt and North Africa.⁶¹ When was Basil's trade boycott lifted, and under what circumstances were travel restrictions annulled? On present evidence a definite reply cannot be given.

With the establishment of the Mirdasid dynasty the status of Aleppo as a buffer was re-established and Basil's ultimate aim in Syria was eventually achieved.

History Department, University of Kuwait

60. Cf. Yahya of Antioch, *Tārīkh*, 243-44.

61. Cf. the documents translated in S.D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society. The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza* (Berkeley-Los Angeles 1967-71) I, 44.

The epigrams of Leo the Philosopher

BARRY BALDWIN

These notes are intended as both compliment and complement to the recent and admirable paper of L.G. Westerink.¹ Leo as scientist and scholar has received his due in modern times,² whereas his contribution to the Byzantine epigram tends to be belittled or ignored. Thus Hunger³ leaves him out of his survey of the genre, even whilst acknowledging the epigrammatic attacks upon him by his own pupil Constantine the Sicilian, whilst Trypanis⁴ can do no better than 'He composed a number of epigrams, mainly on the mathematical, astronomical, and philosophical books he had acquired; among them there is also one strange and apparently improper epigram addressed to his mother'. Neglect on this scale borders on traducement. Not that anyone is going to claim that Leo was a great poet. But an inspection of his themes, sources, and language will show that he deserves better than this.⁵ I am not (of course) implying any criticism of Westerink, whose purpose was to publish an *editio princeps* of Leo's hexameter poem *Job*,⁶ subjoining the epigrams (in his own words) for convenient reference and comparison.

1. 'Leo the Philosopher: *Job* and Other Poems', *Illinois Classical Studies* 11 (1986) 193-222. I use Westerink's numbering, with parenthetical cross-reference to that in the *Anthologia Palatina*. Apart from 4 (9. 203), discussion is restricted to epigrams that are indisputably by Leo, eschewing those that are certainly spurious or doubtfully ascribed; there is nothing to add to Westerink 196-7 on these.

2. Notably from E.E. Lipsic, 'Vizantijskij ucenyj Leo Matematik', *VV* 2 (1947) 106-49, and P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris 1971) 148-76.

3. H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* (Munich 1978) 2, 167-73.

4. C.A. Trypanis, *Greek Poetry from Homer to Seferis* (Chicago 1981) 472.

5. The notice of Leo in the *Tusculum-Lexicon griechischer und lateinischer Autoren des Altertums und des Mittelalters* (Munich 1982) 470-1, pays proper tribute to the content, but ventures no opinion on the merits of Leo's poetic *oeuvre*.

6. Cf. H. Jacobson, 'Job's Suffering in Leo the Philosopher', *B* 57 (1987) 421, for supplement on one point of detail.

Nine of the eleven epigrams assembled by Westerink derive from the Palatine Anthology (all but one from Book 9), in which Leo features as one of the latest datable contributors.⁷ It is, then, legitimate and rewarding to use the other Anthology poets as one point of comparison and contrast for Leo's themes, style, and vocabulary.⁸ Westerink himself (204) engrosses the main features of Leo's metrics, to which survey can be added the poet's one case of a spondee in the fifth foot of an hexameter (9. 2).

1 (9. 200). Λέοντος φιλοσόφου εἰς βιβλὸν μηχανικὴν

Βίβλος μηχανικὴ· Κύρινος δέ μιν ἐξεπόνησε
Μαρκέλλου γνωτοῖο συνερχομένου κατὰ μόχθον.

This first piece, like the five that follow, is a book epigram, designed as frontispiece or colophon to a text. An old and enduringly popular genre, prominent in the Anthology, it requires no epexegetis here.⁹ The present sextet of examples comport a double interest, throwing light as they do on the tastes of a Byzantine *savant* such as Leo and on what was available in his time, especially as several of the authors he celebrates are absent from the *Bibliotheca* of Photius.¹⁰ The composers of this work on mechanics seem otherwise unattested. Reiske¹¹ thought they were the Quirinus and Marcellus who were recipients of various let-

7. Along with his pupils Cometas and Constantine the Sicilian. Other late names include Arethas and Constantine the Rhodian. For what this may signify, we must look to Alan Cameron's long-awaited book on the Anthology.

8. For the last, one can exploit (as far as it currently goes) the Index to the Anthology (Amsterdam 1985-), compiled by V. Citti, E. Degani, G. Giangrande, and G. Scarpa.

9. Except to suggest that some stray Byzantine epigrams preserved without context made sense if placed in this category. For easy instance, the verses on *theriaka* published by P. Antoniou, 'Sur une Epigramme Byzantine convenue dans le Marcianus Graecus 507', *REB* 44 (1986) 229-31, could well have been designed for a book on this subject, most likely the *Theriaka* of Nicander, whose enduring popularity without context is evidenced by Michael Italicus, *Ep.* 35 (ed. Gautier, p. 218, 3-9) and others; cf. N.G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London 1983) 140, 150, 191, 240; also B. Baldwin, 'A Byzantine variant in the text of Nicander', *Mus. Phil. Lond.* 8 (1987) 5-6.

10. As W. Treadgold, *The Bibliotheca of Photius* (Washington, D.C. 1980) 103-4, observes, 'Mathematics and the natural sciences, apart from medicine, were not Photius' strong points'.

11. Reported by H. Beckby in his note (Munich 1965, 2nd ed.) on the poem.

ters from Libanius.¹² This is only a guess, not perhaps a particularly inspired one,¹³ though Marcellus was a doctor and Quirinus a sophist and rhetor, and (as we shall see) Leo was interested in authors of the fourth and fifth centuries. *Mechanike* is a fairly flexible rubric in Greek; *AP* 9. 807 (anonymous) applies it to the sundial made at the behest of Sergius the patriarch in the seventh century. Both Beckby and Paton (in the Loeb) take γνῶτοιο to mean friend, though the word can connote brother or brother-in-law. Joint authorship is a relatively rare ancient phenomenon, hence συνεργομένου may suggest that Marcellus either completed an unfinished work by Quirinus or re-edited it later. Despite the prevalence of the genre, βίβλος openings in the Anthology are restricted to Leo here and poem 3 below, to 1. 119 (anonymous, on the Christianising Homeric cento composed by Patricius), and to 9. 186 (on the plays of Aristophanes, by Antipater of Thessalonica).

2 (9. 201). Τοῦ αὐτοῦ Λέοντος φιλοσόφου εἰς τὴν βίβλον Παύλου
 ἀστρολόγου
 Θέσφατα μαντῶης φοιβηίδος, ὄργια τέχνης
 ἀστρολόγων, Παῦλός μ' ἐδιδάξατο κύδιμος ἀνὴρ.

This distich refers to the late fourth century Paul of Alexandria, author of an extant *Eisagogika*, also credited by the *Suda* (P 810) with *Apotelesmatika*.¹⁴ It is worth adding that the *Suda* dubs Paul (an author not in Photius' *Bibliotheca*) a philosopher, perhaps a dodge to justify reading him, for Leo's astrological tastes had provoked his pupil Constantine to denounce him for paganism in two poems, elegiac and iambic.¹⁵

12. Far more than the two (362, 369) adduced by Beckby; cf. the entries on these characters in *PLRE* 1, 550, 760-1.

13. The *PLRE* notices, by inadvertence or design, do not acknowledge the notion.

14. On Paul, see *PLRE* 1, 684; W. Gundel, H. Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie* 18.4, cols. 2376-86; Hunger 2. 228, 232, 234, 239.

15. Constantine's poems, specifying *inter plurima alia* that astrology will doom Leo to eternal damnation, are printed in *MPG* 107, LXI-LXIV, 661-4. The latest writer on this matter, R.C. McCail, 'Did Constantine of Sicily read Daphnis and Chloe?', *B* 58 (1988) 121, n. 39, follows Lemerle in supposing that Constantine's attacks were an unscrupulous attempt to curry favour with the less tolerant Hellenism of Photius, after Leo's death.

No other poem in the Anthology opens with θέσφατα. The form μαντῶος occurs only here and at *AP* 5. 206, an erotic poem by Agathias, conceivably providing Leo with his model for the allotrope. κύδιμος is a rare variant on κυδάλιμος, only¹⁶ on show in *Homeric Hymn* 4. 46 and Hesiod, *Theog.* 938, both times applied to Hermes; the former passage, describing Hermes' invention of the lyre, may have been in Leo's mind.

3 (9. 202). Τοῦ αὐτοῦ Λέοντος εἰς τὰς βίβλους Πρόκλου καὶ Θέωνος, τῆς μὲν
Θέωνος ἀστρονομικῆς, τῆς δὲ Πρόκλου γεωμετρικῆς

Βίβλος Θέωνος καὶ Πρόκλου τῶν πανσόφων.
βίβλος πόλου τε καὶ χθονὸς φέρει μέτρα·
Θέων πόλον μὲν καὶ Πρόκλος μετρεῖ χθόνα,
Πρόκλος μὲν οὖν γῆν καὶ Θέων μετρεῖ πόλον.
ἄμφω δ' ἐπ' ἴσης τῶν ἐπαίνων ἄξιοι,
ἄμφω δ' ἄμοιβῃν τῶν λόγων τετεύχαστον.
Θέων Πρόκλου γὰρ λαμβάνων σοφὰς Θέσεις
δείκνυσι ταύταις τοὺς δρόμους τῶν ἀστέρων·
Πρόκλος δὲ δείξει τοῦ Θέωνος λαμβάνων
ταύταις ἀναλῦει καὶ προβάλλει τὰς θέσεις.
ἀλλ' ὦ σοφῇ ξυνωρί, χαῖρέ μοι λίαν·
χαίροις, Θέων ἄριστε, πάνσοφον κᾶρα,
ὁ νῦν πυκάζων τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου πόλιν·
χαίροις δὲ καὶ σύ, Πρόκλε, τοῦ Σαρπηδόνοιο
ἄριστον αἶμα τοῖς ὅλοις βοῶμενον.

The two authors here celebrated are apparently the mathematician Theon of Alexandria, late fourth century and father of Hypatia, and the celebrated fifth century Neoplatonist Proclus of Lycia; *AP* 7. 341 constitutes the latter's epitaph.¹⁷ Westerink¹⁸ rejects the old view that this epigram belongs not to Leo but the fifth century on the grounds that 'the puzzling νῦν of 1. 13' cannot refer to the time of writing since Theon and Proclus belonged to different ages. Westerink's concern over νῦν

16. Apart from Pindar, *Olymp.* 14. 24, of ἀεθλα.

17. Neither the *PLRE* notice of Proclus (2. 915-9) nor that of Theon (1. 907) adduce Leo's poem.

18. 195, developing Lemerle 169, n. 80.

leads him to suggest replacing it by $\nu\phi$. Wilson (*SB* 83-4), finding the reference to Alexandria ‘unintelligible as it stands’, thinks Leo may have confounded Theon with the second century AD Theon of Smyrna, but I cannot see how this helps with Alexandria. It would be just as reasonable, perhaps more so, to argue that Leo had mixed up Proclus of Lycia (the point of lines 14-15 about Sarpedon) with the philosopher and mathematician Proclus of Laodicea in Syria described by the *Suda* (P 2472) and provisionally dated to the fourth or fifth century by *PLRE* 1. 742.

One notices that the poem begins with the *book* of Theon and Proclus, not the books, whereas the lemma specifies books. Joint authorship and cognate matters were discussed earlier in connection with Marcellus and Quirinus. It would have been easy to alter the *biblos* of line 1 to the plural, but that expedient does not work for the singular in line 2 because of the verb. Do we then need a Theon and Proclus who lived and worked at the same time, or is it a case of a later scholar re-editing or continuing the work of a predecessor? Or did Leo simply have texts of the chronologically disparate Theon and Proclus in one volume?

There is another possibility. Leo’s pupil, and then teacher in his own right, Cometas, was active in the editing and interpretation of Homer, apparently refurbishing old manuscripts or transcribing them into the new miniscule script.¹⁹ Perhaps Leo’s epigram is saluting similar new editions of Theon and Proclus, whoever they actually were. The present tenses used throughout the poem may enhance this argument, and it would solve the problem of $\nu\psi$, since the line will now mean that the revival of Theon’s work brings new lustre to the scholarly reputation of Alexandria. This notion of revived glory comporting fresh utility is precisely the theme of Cometas’ own poems (*AP* 15. 36-8), of the near-contemporary Ignatius on his grammatical works (*AP* 15. 39), and of the anonymous *AP* 9. 210 which hails the revival in Anastasius I’s time of the *Tactica* of Orbicius, whilst *AP* 9.

19. Cf. Wilson, *SB* 83-3; R. Browning, ‘Homer in Byzantium’, *Viator* 8 (1975) 22-3, also ‘Byzantine Scholarship’, *Past and Present* 28 (1964) 7-8 (both reprinted in his *Studies on Byzantine History, Literature and Education* [London, 1977]); B. Baldwin, ‘The Homeric Scholarship of Cometas’, *Hermes* 113 (1985) 127-8.

205 by the grammarian Artemidorus actually has νῦν in a distich on some new collection of bucolic poems.

Two points of style. The adjective πάνσοφος is largely restricted to Attic tragedy, and Leo may have selected it to enhance the classical patina of his own iambs, albeit Lampe's Patristic Greek Lexicon has many examples of the epithet in Christian authors, of God, men, doctrine, and the like. Similarly, ζυνωρίς, when not referring to a pair of horses, is largely confined to tragic diction, though patristic authors apply it to teams of apostles and nuns.

- 4 (9. 203) Φωτίου πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, ἄλλοι δὲ φασιν
Λέοντος τοῦ φιλοσόφου, εἰς τὴν βίβλον Λευκίπης

Ἔρωτα πικρόν, ἀλλὰ σώφρονα βίον
ὁ Κλειτοφώντος ὥσπερ ἐμφαίνει λόγος·
ὁ Λευκίπης δὲ σωφρονέστατος βίος
ἅπαντας ἐξίστησι, πῶς τετυμμένη
κεκαρμένη τε καὶ κατηχρειωμένη,
τὸ δὴ μέγιστον, τρεῖς θανοῦς· ἔκαρτέρει.
εἶπερ δὲ καὶ σὺ σωφρονεῖν θέλῃς, φίλος,
μὴ τὴν πάρεργον τῆς γραφῆς σκόπει θέαν,
τὴν τοῦ λόγου δὲ πρῶτα συνδρομὴν μάθε·
νυμφοστολεῖ γὰρ τοὺς ποθοῦντας ἐμφρόνως.

The lemma, in itself an interesting glimpse into Byzantine literary critical arguments, is clear and suggestively precise: Photius the patriarch composed this epigram, though there were some (clearly a minority) who attributed it to Leo the philosopher. The usual modern objection to the Photian ascription is that the poem's point, that the content of Achilles Tatius' novel is more important than its style and that the *dénouement* is satisfyingly moral, seems to contradict the Patriarch's critique in his *Bibliotheca* (cod. 87) where the novelist's style is commended but his obscenity roundly condemned (likewise in cod. 94).

Possibly Photius changed his mind.²⁰ This is not just crude cutting of the Gordian knot. The Patriarch is not entirely con-

20. As apparently did the later scholarly bishop Gregory of Corinth on this very question of Achilles Tatius; cf. Wilson, *SB* 186, also A.R. Dyck, *Michael Psellus: The*

sistent throughout the *Bibliotheca* on matters of morality and obscenity (who is?). He was unmoved by Lucian's *Dialogues of the Courtesans* (cod. 128) despite their Lesbian and other such content, and excused the 'shameful indecency' of the *Asinus* (cod. 129) on the grounds that it was part of Lucian's mockery of paganism. That escape clause would not work for Achilles Tatius. But at the end of his review (cod. 166) of Antonius Diogenes' *Wonders Beyond Thule*, Photius produced a blanket formula for pagan novels: provided that the innocent were saved and the wicked brought to account, they were all right. Now the point of our epigram is precisely that it commends Achilles Tatius' novel because the innocent heroine survives all her tribulations and the lovers end up getting married — in the poet's own words, a bitter passion but a moral life. Viewed thus, the epigram would not really be a flagrant contradiction of the *Bibliotheca's* critique of Achilles Tatius.

Dyck,²¹ who thinks that it is, offers an ingenious solution. Rightly stressing the lemma's emphasis on Photius' title, he suggests that 'the circulation of this notable encomium under the patriarch's name may have been intended to protect the novel against ecclesiastical disapproval'. A very Byzantine strategem, that, in the worst modern sense of the term! The objection to it is that the novel of Achilles Tatius does not seem to have needed any such protection. It circulated freely throughout the Byzantine period,²² not just amongst the relatively sophisticated circles of Psellus but in the private libraries of such as the provincial landowner Boilas, a pious and not specially cultivated individual.²³

A point that has been overlooked is how perfectly our epigram agrees with the compliments paid by Photius (cod. 73) to the

Essays on Euripides and George of Pisidia and on Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius (Vienna 1986) 86.

21. *Op. cit.* 82.

22. Cf. Wilson, *SB* 26, 84, 172-6, 186, 225.

23. See S. Vyonis, 'The Will of a Provincial Magnate, Eustathius Boilas (1059)', *DOP* 11 (1957) 263-77; N.G. Wilson, 'Books and Readers in Byzantium', in *Byzantine Books and Bookmen* (Washington D.C. 1975) 7-8; C. Mango, *Byzantium: the Empire of New Rome* (London 1980) 239-40.

Aethiopica of Heliodorus for its theme of survival of innocence amidst dangers and temptations, and its conclusion of pious sacrifice and marital preparations. Photius, of course, accepted the notion²⁴ that Heliodorus had converted to Christianity, which would incline him towards putting the best possible construction on the *Aethiopica*; the *Suda* (A 4695) makes the same claim for Achilles Tatius himself! Possibly, then, Photius' name was attached to our epigram by accident (or design, if Dyck's notion be preferred) because what it says about Achilles Tatius is so close to what the Patriarch had said about Heliodorus.

It should also be observed that this is the only epigram attributed to Photius in the Anthology. This does not rule him out,²⁵ but taken along with his general lack of secular poetic productions may be thought to weaken his claim.

The fact remains that the epigram seemed Photian to most Byzantine critics. And Westerink (194, n. 4) is inclined to rule out Leo on the grounds of metrical technique, especially the paroxytone ending.²⁶ This argument is inconclusive. As Westerink himself later (204) shows, Leo's iambs admit various endings. There is no reason why he could not have come over to the paroxytone that started to prevail in his time. And Gaslee's claim that 'the style of prosody is too late for Leo' is silly — it would also be too late for Photius!

The epigram is also the only one of the cluster ascribed to Leo that is on a work of literature rather than science, albeit Wilson (*SB* 84) thinks he was drawn more by literary than scientific motives to Plato. This fact does not militate strongly against Leo's claims. It is stating the obvious to observe that he was an educated Byzantine with educated Byzantine tastes. As poem 8 shows, he can knock off an Homeric cento with the best of them, and the language and style of his epigrams at large disclose wide reading, taste, and skill. And, as seen, Achilles Tatius was in no way an *outré* author, but one well within the Byzantine mainstream.

24. First found in Socrates, *HE* 5. 22; cf. Nicephorus Callistus, *HE* 13. 34, for subsequent refinement.

25. As Beckby's author index shows, there are several 'single hit' poets represented.

26. The Loeb editor of Achilles Tatius, S. Gaselee, x, had already declared in favour of Photius on these same grounds. Wilson, *SB* 84, says the poem is 'perhaps' by Leo, without elaboration. McCail, *art. cit.* 122, n. 46, has no doubts that Leo is the author.

It has to be said that pretty well any Byzantine man of letters with a facility for epigrams could have written this piece. Some²⁷ do more Gordian knot cutting and suggest that another Leo was the author. One can also adduce, for easy instance, the iambic verses providing a very similar defence of Heliodorus' novel tentatively ascribed²⁸ to Theodore Prodromus. Still, one persists in the hope that it is from the pen of Leo. It would enhance his claims to all-round culture, as well as being overall a decent piece, sensible in its approach, sometimes distinctive in vocabulary (καταχρειῶ is rare in patristic Greek texts and only here in classical or classicising ones), and stylistically adroit — νυμφοστολέω, though very common in Christian Greek is rare in pagan, one of the few authors to use it being Achilles Tatius himself (e.g. 1. 18; 5. 16), thereby showing how cleverly our poet reproduces his subject's own style.

5 (9. 214) Λέοντος φιλοσόφου εἰς τὸν φιλόσοφον Πορφύριον

Τῇ τῶν λόγων σου κογχύλῃ, Πορφύριε,
βάπτεις τὰ χεῖλη καὶ στολίζεις τὰς φρένας.

Both Westerink (194) and Wilson (*SB* 84) think the Porphyrian work in question is the *Eisagoge*. A perfectly reasonable guess, but only that, and we should not rush with Westerink into inferring what else was contained in Leo's text on this basis. The *Suda* (P 2098) provides a large bibliography of Porphyry's works, mentioning that *astronomica* (a known interest of Leo) were his speciality. The pun on his name was traditional.²⁹ Leo imparts a degree of linguistic colour of his own to the well-worn theme: the form κογχύλῃ is definitely attested only here in *LSJ*, whilst Lampe implies that it was a chronicler's, i.e. (perhaps) a demotic term, with two of his four examples coming from Malalas and a third from the *Paschal Chronicle*. Likewise, *LSJ* restrict the figurative use of στολίζω to Leo, with Lampe showing it to be patristic, but rare.

27. Cf. H. Gartner, 'Charikleia in Byzanz', *Antike und Abendland* 15 (1969) 47-69.

28. By A. Colonna in his edition (Rome 1938) 371.

29. From Porphyry himself, *Vita Plotini* 17. 6-10, through Eunapius, *VS* 457, to the *Suda* (P 2099).

6 (9. 578) Λέοντος φιλοσόφου εἰς τὰ Κωνικά Ἀπολλωνίου

᾿Ων ἦδε βίβλος ἔνδον ὠδίνω, φίλε,
 βαθύς χαρακτήρ καὶ περισκελὴς ἄγαν·
 δεῖται κολυμβητοῦ δὲ πάντως Δηλίου.
 εἰ δ' αὖ κυβιστήσῃ τις εἰς ἑμοὺς μυχοὺς
 καὶ πᾶν μεταλλεύσειεν ἀκριβῶς βάθος,
 γεωμετρῶν τὰ πρῶτα λήψεται γέρα,
 σοφὸς δ' ἀναμφίλεκτος εἰσκριθήσεται.
 τούτων δὲ μάρτυς ἐγγυητὴς τε Πλάτων.

The *Conics* of Apollonius was a standard work on the subject, and needs no comment here. However, the epigram may provide a point of interest regarding transmission of ancient texts and Leo's own reading. *A propos* Plato's zeal for geometry, both Westerink and Beckby adduce Elias, *In Categ.* 118. 8, for the celebrated if apocryphal superscription over Plato's Academy, 'Let no one who cannot do geometry come in'.³⁰ One person who lectured on the *Conics* was Eutocius of Ascalon³¹ at Alexandria in the early sixth century. Our authority for this is Elias himself. If Leo did owe his remark on Plato and geometry to Elias, this would temper Wilson's view that the latter's lectures did not have much of a circulation in Byzantium, or it might suggest that Leo's reading was wider than most.³²

This poem comports one or two points of linguistic interest. In lines 4-5, ἑμοὺς μυχοὺς . . . μεταλλεύειεν is strikingly similar to *AP* 6. 302. 5 (by Leonidas of Tarentum), μεταλλεύεις τοῦτον μυχόν. εἰσ κρίνομαι in the sense of to be adjudged is found only here, according to *LSJ*. Although common in patristic Greek, the sonorous ἀναμφίλεκτος is restricted to the critics Dionysus of Halicarnassus and Longinus, the first of whom was well known to Photius and other Byzantines,³³ and it occurs nowhere else in the Anthology.

30. Ed. A Busse, *CAG* 18. 1 (Berlin 1900).

31. Cf. *PLRE* 2. 439; Wilson, *SB* 45-8.

32. Obviously, this argument is not invulnerable. Plato's geometric tastes were well celebrated, to say the least, and an alternative sixth century source for the Academy superscription might be John Philoponus, *In de Anim.* 117. 29, ed. M. Hayduck, *CAG* 15 (Berlin 1897).

33. Cf. Wilson, *SB* 104, 139, 148, 169-72, 272. Longinus was much less read; Wilson, 139, 150, 262. We should also notice the cognate adverb in Lucian, *Rhet. Praec.* 15.

7 (9. 579). Τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς κηρύκιον

Σχῆμα παλαιοτάτων ἀνδρῶν κηρύκιον ἄθρει,
Θρινακίης οἰκιστὰ Κορίνθιε, ὅς ποτ' ἔπινες
ἀμφιβόητα ῥέεθρα Συρηκοσίας Ἀρεθοῦσης.

This is the real puzzler amongst Leo's epigrams. 'Erklärung unbekannt', decided Beckby, and Paton was similarly despairing. Westerink, finding it 'an enigma for which no satisfactory solution has yet been offered', thinks in terms of some sort of *technopaegnon* with three lines of almost equal letter length, one for the staff, the other two for the serpents. He further presumes the addressee to be a Sicilian resident in Constantinople, Leo's student and subsequent enemy Constantine the Sicilian being offered as a possibility.

I have no magic solution either, but suggest that one might be found by abandoning herald's rod and serpents and considering other ingredients. I have a feeling that the poem has something to do with the beacon signalling system attributed to Leo.³⁴ σχῆμα is a word with very many meanings and nuances — it certainly does not have to mean a staff or rod. κηρύκιον as an adjective is not recorded in the lexica; *AP* 11. 124 (Nicarchus) has it as a noun, a very rare allotrope (and with a short -u) for κηρύκειον.³⁵ A chain of beacons can obviously be described as a form or system of heraldry. And it is equally appropriate to call Leo's timing devices and fire signals something thought of by men of old, going back as they did at least as far as Aeschylus.³⁶ A Sicilian allusion would be especially suitable if we follow Pattenden (274) in thinking that Leo had read Polyaeus' account (*Strat.* 6. 16. 2) of the Punic signalling system from Lilybaeum to Carthage.

The Corinthian founder of Sicily was, strictly speaking, Archias, who did in fact receive from Apollo at Delphi an oracular en-

34. Described at length by P. Pattenden, 'The Byzantine Early Warning System', *B* 53 (1983), 258-99, rejecting the doubts raised about its existence by V. Aschoff, *Über den byzantinischen Feuertelegraphen und Leon den Mathematiker* (Deutsches Museum: Abhandlungen und Berichte 48 [1980]).

35. Whether the single word κηρύκιον that constitutes Aristophanes, fr. 518, is noun or adjective is obviously unclear.

36. Cf. Pattenden 269-74 for discussion of this and cognate ancient accounts.

couragement that calls Sicily Thrinacia and waxes eloquent over 'the bubbling mouth of Alpheius mingling with the springs of broad Arethusa'.³⁷ Westerink adduces only *AP* 14. 73. 3, an oracle to the Megarians, where there is a line about drinking the waters of lovely Arethusa. This sort of language is, in fact, poetically commonplace as (e.g.) *AP* 7. 714 (an anonymous epitaph for the poet Ibycus) and, perhaps more to the point since it follows directly upon Leo's Homeric cento, 9. 362, an anonymous description of some invasion of Greece that made Arethusa weep. Also, given Leo's poem on him, it is striking that the myth is described at some length in Achilles Tatius 1. 18 where it is directly postluded by an anecdote of love between two snakes.

The epigram, then, could be something to do with Leo's own beacon system, addressed to a character called Archias rather than Westerink's Constantine. Archias is a highly convenient name in context since it would almost pun on Mt Argaeus, a key link in Leo's telegraphic chain.³⁸ Conceivably, it is some sort of book epigram, or parody thereof, having to do either with a work by Leo himself or a text of Polyaeus or some treatise or extract that had to do with the Sicily-Carthage chain.³⁹ The entire tone of the poem is somewhat ambiguous. Does ἀμφιβόητα here mean famous (as Beckby and Paton take it) or roaring? Nonnus (*Dionys.* 26. 141; 45, 44) has it in both senses. The epithet is elsewhere only in the Anthology twice, 9. 241. 2 (Antipater of Thessalonica) and 16. 278. 5 (Paulus Silentiarius). One cannot really tell if the addressee is a contemporary or some figure from the past adduced in connection with a book, nor whether the tone is friendly or hostile. If the latter, there could be some obscene *double-entendre*, given that σχῆμα can be a Christian euphemism for genitals,⁴⁰ and drinking the waters of Arethusa might allude to fellatio or cunnilingus. But this is not a line I need or particularly want to pursue, so leave the whole matter here, hoping

37. Pausanias 5. 7. 3.

38. Cf. Pattenden 267-8.

39. And would it be too farfetched to believe that Leo also had in mind the phrase τὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς σχῆμα from an author he knew well, namely Plato, *Laws* 685c?

40. *LSJ* give an example from the Septuagint.

that this investigation may encourage fellow-scholars to do better, and wondering if it is more than coincidence that the one poem by Archias of Byzantium in the Anthology (7. 278) is an epitaph on a shipwrecked man that includes descriptions of surging seas and brine-beaten hills.

8 (9. 361). Λέοντος φιλοσόφου εἰς παρθένον φθαρεῖσαν, Ὀμηρόκεντρα

Μῆτερ ἐμὴ δύσμητερ, ἀπηνέα θυμὸν ἔχουσα,
λίην ἄχθομαι ἔλκος, ὃ με βροτὸς οὐτασεν ἀνὴρ,
νύκτα δι' ὄφρναίην, ὅτε θ' εὐδουσι βροτοὶ ἄλλοι,
γυμνὸς ἄτερ κόρυθός τε καὶ ἀσπίδος, οὐδ' ἔχεν ἔγχος.
πᾶν δ' ὑπεθερμάνθη ξίφος αἵματι· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
οὐρόν τε προέηκεν ἀπῆμονά τε λιαρόν τε.

A Homeric cento. The lines come respectively from *Od.* 23. 97; *Il.* 5. 361; *Il.* 10. 83; *Il.* 21. 50; *Il.* 16. 333 (= *Od.* 1.123); *Od.* 5. 268. There is little need to follow Stadtmüller and Beckby in assigning *AP* 9. 381-2 to Leo, and none at all to think that Trypanis was right in seeing the present piece as an indecent attack on the poet's own mother. Homeric cento was a popular poetic game, likewise Virgilian in Latin, and in both languages it could be turned to both pious (e.g. Patricius, *AP* 1. 119, and the efforts of Proba) and lubricious (one thinks easily of Ausonius) ends. In Leo's case, there may be a hint of the *inter faeces ac urinam nascimur* of Augustine regarding the gross physical circumstances of human birth. It is worth noticing that Leo's opening line is also used in *AP* 11. 298, a group of verses describing a picture (was Leo also describing some work of art like this?), whilst his line 3 is virtually identical with one in the anonymous sexy Homeric cento on Hero and Leander at *AP* 9. 381, except that there the night is the ambrosial one of *Il.* 24. 363. But these common features do not argue for the same author, being simply convenient stock-in-trades for cento making.

9 (15. 12). Λέοντος φιλοσόφου εἰς ἑαυτὸν τοῦ ἐπονομαζομένου Ἑλλήνος

Εὐγε Τύχη με ποεῖς ἀπραγμοσύνη μ' Ἐπικούρου
ἡδίστη κομέουσα καὶ ἡσυχίη τέρπουσα.
τίπτε δέ μοι χρέος ἀσχολίης πολυκηδέος ἀνδρῶν;

οὐκ ἐθέλω πλοῦτον, τυφλὸν φίλον, ἄλλοπρόσαλλον,
οὐ τιμάς· τιμαὶ δὲ βροτῶν ἄμενηνος ὄνειρος.
ἔρρε μοι, ὦ Κίρκης δνοφερὸν σπέος· αἰδέομαι γὰρ
οὐράνιος γεγαῶς βαλάνους ἅτε θηρίον ἔσθειν·
μισῶ Λωτοφάγων γλυκερὴν λιπόπατριν ἔδωδὴν,
Σειρήνων τε μέλος καταγωγὸν ἀναίνομαι ἐχθρῶν·
ἀλλὰ λαβεῖν θεόθεν ψυχοσσόον εὐχομαι ἄνθος,
μῶλυ, κακῶν δοξῶν ἀλκτῆριον· ὅτα δὲ κηρῶ
ἀσφαλέως κλείσας προφυγεῖν γενετήσιον ὄρμην.
ταῦτα λέγων τε γράφων τε πέρας βίότοιο κιχείην.

The only Anthology poem attributed to Leo that is not from Book 9. The lemma might imply that this statement of the poet's philosophy of life either provoked the charges of paganism mentioned earlier or was a reply to them; probably the former, in view of the favourable mention of Epicurus, that philosopher being one of the characters adduced by Constantine the Sicilian in his attack on Leo's supposed paganism. The ethical combinations and contrasts of lines 1-2 have some linguistic affinity with Thucydides 1. 70 and Demosthenes, *In Meid.* 141, both authors that Leo is likely to have read, though it is not necessary to require them as his present inspiration, given the frequency of all three terms in Anthology poets (e.g. 9. 379. 3; 9. 8. 2; 16. 244. 6). *LSJ* single out Leo's as the only application of ἄλλοπρόσαλλος of wealth; Agathias (1. 34, the word's only other occurrence in the Anthology) has it of σέβας. Since Beckby does not include it in his register of Homeric allusions, *Od.* 10. 241-3 can be added as the source of Circe and acorn-eating in lines 6-7. This poem, in addition to its fifth foot spondee in line 2 (the only such effect in Leo's epigrams, albeit his *Job* has a few cases, e.g. 32. 256), has some distinctive vocabulary: λιπόπατρις is unique in this sense;⁴¹ ψυχοσσόος is only here and at 9. 197 (a book epigram by Marinus on the Life of Proclus) in the Anthology, and elsewhere restricted to Nonnus, *Paraphr. Jo.* 7. 144; γενετήσιος in line 12 is a *hapax legomenon*, possibly coined by Leo to provide a metrically convenient sexual euphemism.⁴²

41. Elsewhere, the word is only in Nonnus, *Dionys.* 1. 131, and glossed in *Etym. Magn.* p. 759. 41.

42. Further bowdlerised as 'the ill inborn impulse' in Paton's Loeb.

10. Λέοντος φιλοσόφου

Ψυχρὸν τὸ γῆρας, ἢ τ' ἐμὴ κρᾶσις φύσει
 (φεῦ) φλεγματώδης· μὴν δ' ὁ φεβρουάριος
 ψυχρὸς μάλιστα, ζῳδιὸν δ' Ὑδροχόου
 τὸ νῦν πολεῖον καὶ συνὸν μεθ' ἡλίου
 πῆγνυσι καὶ τὸν οἶνον ἐν τισιν τόποις
 τοὺς τ' ἀμπορεῖς ῥήγνυσιν ἐκ τῆς ψύξεως.
 ὁ δ' οἶκος ἔνθα νῦν κατασκηνῶ πάλιν
 ἀγάννιφός τε καὶ λίαν δυσχείμερος.
 ὁ θρασκίας δὲ δριμύς ἐστι καὶ πικρός,
 ὀξύς, δυσαῆς, Ταρτάρου πνοᾶς ἔχων.
 ὁ γάρ νότος λέλοιπεν ἡμῶν τὸ κλίμα.
 πῶς οὖν, τοσοῦτων ψυχροτήτων ἐν μέσῳ
 ὀρών με συσχεθέντα τὸν ταλάντατον,
 ὕδωρ κελεύεις προσφέρεσθαι, φίλτατε;
 εἰ γάρ με πείσεις, ἢ χιῶν γενήσομαι
 ἢ καὶ χάλαζα, καὶ θανῶν νεκροστόλοις
 ἄψαυστος ὡς κρύσταλλος ὦν φανήσομαι
 τῇ σῇ πεποιθῶς ψυκτικῇ παραινέσει.
 ἄπελθε τοίνυν εἰς τόπους τῆς Ἰνδίας
 εἰς τ' Ἀγησύμβων εἰς τε Βλεμύων πόλεις,
 ὅπου λέγουσιν ἀμπέλους μὴ βλαστάνειν·
 ἐκεῖσε δεῖξον σὴν ἰατρικὴν, σοφέ.
 ἡμῖν γάρ οὐκ ἔνεστι χρεῖα τῆς τέχνης,
 εἰ ζῆν θέλομεν καὶ τὸν ἥλιον βλέπειν.

In this poem from the *Sylloge Euphemiāna*,⁴³ Leo ridicules his doctor for prescribing a regimen of cold water for a chill-prone man living in an icy house in a particularly bleak February. Epigrams against doctors were a popular sport, and feature prominently in the Anthology (9. 112-26; 11. 382, this latter by Agathias, an elaborate effort in eleven elegiac couplets, involving a fever-ridden patient). Whether it describes an actual episode in Leo's life or is pure poetic confection, we cannot say. Either way, it could have been exploited by Kazhdan⁴⁴ in his excellent survey of Byzantine attitudes towards the medical profession. Cold water treatments went back a long way, being popularised at Rome by the success Antonius Musa had with them with the ailing

43. Cf. Westerink 196 for more details.

44. A. Kazhdan, 'The Image of the Medical Doctor in Byzantine Literature of the Tenth to Twelfth Centuries', *DOP* 38 (1984) 43-51.

Augustus, although Suetonius (*Aug.* 81. 1) says this treatment was for the emperor's abscessed liver, not connecting it with the imperial catarrh that afflicted him each spring. Naturally, I am not suggesting that Leo had been reading Suetonius or Horace,⁴⁵ *Ep.* 1. 15, or Pliny, *NH* 29. 10, who ridicules the newly fashionable doctor Charmis of Massilia for persuading even old men to bathe in cold water in the midst of winter frosts. These are common elements in a common theme, though the similarities between the Roman accounts and Leo do catch the eye.

There is some distinctive language in this poem. The inaugural cold old age may comport a pun on the other meaning of γέρας as a snake skin,⁴⁶ with regard to his scaly flesh; the coldness of the snake was proverbial in classical literature (for easy instance, Virgil, *Ecl.* 8. 70). *LSJ* give no poetic example of φλεγματώδης, nor of ψύχης. ἀγάννιφος is elsewhere restricted to Homer and a fragment of Epicharmus; since Homer (*Il.* 1. 420) applies it to Olympus, Leo's present use is pleasantly mock epic. He gets a similar effect out of δυσχείμερος, an epithet elsewhere only in the *Iliad*, of Dodona. Also Homeric is δусаής, used by one other Anthology poet, Phaedimus in 7. 739. There could be a play on words here as well, since the adjective is applied to seals and medicines in the sense of foul-smelling by Oppian (*Cyn.* 3. 114; *Hal.* 4. 662), an author Leo had conceivably read.⁴⁷ Finally, there is the eye-catching νεκρόστολος in line 16, apparently only here and (in the plural) in Artemidorus 4. 56. Neither *LSJ* nor Stephanus notice the Leo passage, and Lampe does not register the word as patristic; the cognate verb, unique to Lucian, *Charon* 24, should be noticed.

11. Λέοντος σιλοσόφου εἰς τραυλὸν μαθητὴν αὐτοῦ

ᾧ τραυλορῆμον τραυλεπίτραυλε γνάθε,
τραυλόλαλον πάντραπευλον ἐντραυλον στόμα,

45. Though cannot resist here quoting Westerink 203 on Leo's 'transformation of Homeric verse into a colloquial, almost Horatian hexameter', *à propos* his *Job*.

46. If there is a play on words, Leo may owe it to Aristophanes, *Lys.* 670.

47. The didactic content would have appealed to him; cf. Wilson, *SB* 148, 197, 207, 225, 240, for Byzantine knowledge of Oppian.

τραυληγοροῦν ἀναρθρον τρυγόνος τρόπον,
 σύριζε, κράζε, τρύζε σὸν τραυλὸν μέλος,
 κροῦ κροῦ κεκραγῶς ἐν πρυμνοῖς δένδρων κλάδοις,

A characteristically Byzantine bare-knuckled set of iambs directed against an enemy's physical defect or mannerism. It would obviously be neat and convenient to identify the victim as the quaestor Anastasius, author of a pious poem (*AP* 15. 28) on the Crucifixion and nicknamed *Traulos* (the lisper), but Westerink's (196-7) chronological reservations must act as constraint. The piling-up of polysyllabic neologisms⁴⁸ is characteristic of this sort of Byzantine name-calling, being most marked in the exchanges between Constantine the Rhodian and Theodore the eunuch;⁴⁹ Cassia's virulent attack on the Armenians furnishes another pertinent example.⁵⁰

In fine, this dossier of epigrams may not throw that much light on Leo's life and career, but it does illumine his literary and scientific tastes, his philosophy of life (not necessarily one consistently maintained, of course), and (subject to the ever-present danger of the biographical fallacy) some of his personal feelings and vendettas. As a poet, Leo is competent at worst, frequently distinctive in vocabulary, at reasonable ease in more than one metre, capable of ringing the changes on stock themes and expressions, overall an attractive advertisement for the Byzantine secular poetry of his day.

Department of Classics
University of Calgary

48. None of them are in *LSJ* or Lampe; Stephanus notices one or two of them, giving no other source.

49. Published by Matrangola, *Anecd. Graec.* 2. 625-32 (Rome, 1850); cf. G. Downey, 'Constantine the Rhodian: His Life and Writings', *Studies in Honor of Albert Mathias Friend Jr.* (Princeton 1955) 214.

50. Text and commentary in B. Baldwin, *An Anthology of Byzantine Poetry* (Amsterdam 1985) 154-6.

The imperial panels at San Vitale: a reconsideration

CHARLES BARBER

The imperial panels at San Vitale, Ravenna play a prominent role in Byzantine art history. These mosaics have engendered a lengthy bibliography, much of it dedicated to interpreting the possible connotations of these works.¹ There has been debate over the nature of the ceremonial depicted, over the relationship of these panels to the rest of the programme of decoration within the church and over the representation of imperial power.² This paper will argue that a consideration of gender, as represented in these panels, can add to our understanding of these important works of art and the social climate which produced them.

At first glance the mosaics of Justinian and Theodora in San Vitale appear to present the viewer with a balanced pair of im-

1. The bibliography on S. Vitale is extensive, so I have restricted this to more important recent works:

G. Rodenwalt, 'Bemerkungen zu den Kaisermosaiken in San Vitale', *JdI* LIX-LX (1944-45), 88-110

O. von Simson, *Sacred Fortress. Byzantine art and statecraft in Ravenna* (Chicago 1948)

F.W. Deichmann, *Ravenna Hauptstadt des Spätantiken Abendlandes* vols I (1969), II, 2 (1976) and III (1958 Wiesbaden)

G. Stricevic, 'Iconografia dei mosaici imperiali a San Vitale', *Felix Ravenna* 80 (1959) 5-27

A. Grabar, 'Quel est le sens de l'offrande de Justinien et de Theodora sur les mosaïques de Saint-Vital?' *Felix Ravenna* 81 (1960) 63-77

G. Stricevic, 'Sure le probleme de l'iconographie des mosaïques imperiales de Saint-Vital', *Felix Ravenna* 85 (1962) 80-100

S. MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley 1981) (hereafter *Art*).

2. On the nature of the ceremonial represented here see the debate between Stricevic and Grabar (note 1) and T.F. Mathews, *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy* (Univ. Park, 1971) 146-7. On the place of the panels within the programme of decoration in San Vitale see von Simpson, *op. cit.* 23-39 and S. MacCormack, *Art*, 260-64. On imperial portraiture see von Simson, *op. cit.* 27-29 and Deichmann, *op. cit.* II, 2, 187.

perial portraits (plates one and two).³ In San Vitale the Emperor and Empress stand opposite to one another, their gazes fixed on each other across the apse. Both are haloed, crowned and clothed in imperial purple. Each is accompanied by courtiers. But, as will be shown below, this apparent equivalence is undermined by a number of pictorial devices.

The manufacture of these images in San Vitale can be dated to about 547.⁴ They are situated next to the apse windows, immediately beneath the conch of the apse. The Justinian panel is to the left, the Theodora panel to the right. They are part of a wider programme of decoration in the presbytery area. This has some influence on the particular forms of representation present in these panels. The use of liturgical references in the imagery — the chalice and paten for example — establishes these panels as a part of the wider programme. Nevertheless, the issue of gender that is being raised here lies strictly between these two panels. As a result they will be treated in isolation from the remainder of the programme.⁵

Justinian is at the centre of his panel. To the right of him is Archbishop Maximian of Ravenna with two priests. The Archbishop is the only figure in these two panels to be identified by an inscription. Behind and to the immediate left of the Emperor are courtiers and at the extreme left of the panel there is a group of soldiers. The priests carry an incenser, a gospel and a cross. The Emperor carries a paten. The particular combination of elements carried by the priests indicates that reference is being made to the Little Entrance at the start of the Liturgy when these items were brought into the church.⁶ The figures stand in a space

3. von Simson, *op. cit.* 27-29 and Deichmann, *op. cit.* II, 2, 187.

4. The church was dedicated in 547 (Deichmann, *op. cit.* II, 2, 48) and Theodora died in June 548 (*The Chronicle of John Malalas*, tr. E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys and R. Scott [Melbourne 1986] 289, Book 18.104). Assuming that this is a portrait of the living Theodora (see below), the images should be dated to about 547.

5. Such an approach is not intended to deny that these images are a part of the wider programme of this decoration. However, the issue of gender through which I am analysing these portraits lies primarily between these two panels.

6. T.F. Mathews, *op. cit.* 147.

enclosed by framing columns. This suggests an interior space, but the use of gold tesserae makes the setting ambivalent.

The Theodora panel shares some of the features of the Justinian panel. Both panels are framed by columns. The imperial figure is central and stands surrounded by courtiers. Theodora holds a chalice, indicating that she is a participant in the same Liturgy as Justinian. Further to this liturgical connection she is united to Justinian through the use of a halo, the strong purple cloak and the crown; the attributes of an imperial figure. The Empress is attended by two male and seven female courtiers. The spatial arrangement in Theodora's panel is more complex than Justinian's. To the left is a darkened curtained doorway, at the centre a niche, in the foreground a fountain, and to the right a hanging cloth across the upper right hand corner of the panel. This space can be identified as an atrium of a church. The fountain suggests this identification. The implication is that Theodora and her court are about to enter the church through the darkened doorway.

A literal reading of these panels suggests they are depicting an enactment of the Liturgy.⁷ The elements of the court, the Church and the paraphernalia of ritual support this view. The lack of a clear definition of the space in Justinian's panel has led to the conclusion that the Emperor and his entourage have already entered the church. The curtained doorway and the fountain in Theodora's panel can be understood as the representation of the atrium of the church.⁸ The implication is that Theodora and her entourage are following the Emperor into the church. Yet the division of the ceremonial procession across the two panels acts to undermine (without denying) this narrative interpretation of these mosaics. As a representation of a ceremony it disturbs the sense of cohesion enacted in ceremonial by dividing the participants into two distinct groups,⁹ but as a representation of the

7. *ibid.*, 146-47; Deichmann, *op. cit.* II, 2, 180.

8. *ibid.*

9. S. MacCormack, *Art*, 239-66; *eadem*, 'Christ, the Emperor, Time and Ceremonial', *B* 52 (1982) 287-309.

Emperor and Empress it allows for the distinct portrayal of their separate roles.

The analysis of these panels will begin with the specific portraits of the Emperor and Empress. In particular, two aspects in the representation of the Empress serve to distinguish her portrayal from that of Justinian. Theodora, unlike Justinian, is depicted as being tall, even taller than her male companions. This is in conflict with textual evidence which describes her as being short.¹⁰ Some reason is required to account for this disparity between the visual and the verbal evidence. The Empress is situated beneath a scalloped niche, whereas Justinian has no such backdrop. Arguments given to account for this use of the niche include the following. The use of a niche in this period has been identified as a standard type for the representation of an imperial figure. The comparisons frequently cited are the 'Ariadne' ivories of c500.¹¹ A more recent reading of these mosaics has argued that this use of the niche is designed to show that Theodora was dead by the time that these mosaics were set. As such the open darkened door can be read as her means of transit to the other world.¹² Against the first of these arguments is the fact that the designers of the mosaic saw no need to set Justinian within a niche in order to define him as an Emperor; why then was it felt necessary to place Theodora within the niche? The problem with the second argument is that it ignores the chalice that Theodora carries and so undermines the clear references within the work to the liturgical ceremony in which Theodora is participating.¹³

10. Procopius, *Secret History*, Loeb ed. H.B. Dewing, X.11.

11. Deichmann, *op. cit.* II, 2, 182. For the ivories see: W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters* (Mainz 1976) Taf. 26, pl. 51, 52.

12. S. MacCormack, *Art*, 263.

13. MacCormack's argument provides the most fundamental reassessment of this imagery (*Art*, 260-264). She raises a number of points highlighting the differences in the representation of the Emperor and the Empress. The principle cause for these differences is, MacCormack argues, that this is the representation of a dead Empress. The niche, the fountain and the doorway of Theodora's panel are interpreted as elements in the representation of the dead Empress (see my alternative reading of these below). The representation of a dead Empress and a living Emperor is possible. Paul the Silentiary describes such an image in his *ekphrasis* of the rebuilt St. Sophia (C. Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire* [Toronto 1986] 89). From Paul's description of the equivalence of these portrayals it is apparent that the artist in St.

The visual devices of Theodora's height and of her niche are just two of several means by which the designer of these mosaics has chosen to distinguish the Emperor from the Empress. These visual signs will be analysed in greater detail below. The question remains as to why these differences are introduced into these images. This paper will argue that these differences find their basis in the sixth-century perception of the gender of the Emperor and Empress.

Any analysis of these panels in terms of gender requires a knowledge of the attitudes regarding gender held by the sixth-century viewer. For instance, what are the attitudes to gender available to the sixth-century viewer? Do these attitudes apply to imperial figures, or do holders of this rank transcend conceptions of gender?

The framework of Byzantine sexual attitudes lies in the Biblical discourse. The assumptions established in the Biblical texts dominate the patristic literature on women and this in turn prevails within Byzantine society. This can be demonstrated if a statement on gender by John Chrysostom is examined. In his *Discourse II on Genesis 2* Chrysostom wrote: 'Then why is the man said to be in the "image of God" and the woman is not? Because what Paul says about the "image" does not pertain to form. The "image" has rather to do with authority, and this only the man has; the woman has it no longer'.¹⁴ Behind this statement lies the Fall (Genesis 3, 16) and its description of woman as the inferior of the man: 'your (Eve's) desire shall be to your husband,

Sophia found it unnecessary to introduce the props identified in the Theodora panel by MacCormack to represent Theodora as a dead person. MacCormack suggests that Theodora's post-mortem role in the San Vitale scheme is to act as a foil to the Emperor. A parallel is drawn with Corpius' *In laudem Iustini minoris* (ed. A. Cameron [London 1976]) in which the Empress Sophia, as an embodiment of wisdom, is understood as a foil to the Emperor Justin II, who embodies justice. This wordplay is not limited to the Emperor and Empress. It also includes the Emperor's mother Vigilantia (Preface, lines 20-24). The problem is whether this verbal model should be applied to the visual text of the San Vitale panels. MacCormack's assumption that this model can be applied rests on the identification of the Theodora panel as a portrayal of the dead Empress. I will argue below that the evidence used by MacCormack to present this as a dead Theodora can be interpreted in a wholly different manner.

14. *Discourse 2 on Genesis 2* (PG 54) col. 589.

and he shall rule over you'. In this verse Eve, and therefore woman, is placed below man as a result of her role in the Fall. This position of male authority is further enhanced in Chrysostom's eyes, through reference to Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. In this Paul writes of the relative positions of man and woman thus: 'For a man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man . . . that is why a woman ought to have a veil on her head', and: 'But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a woman is her husband'.¹⁵ Paul and his followers are seeking to show that even prior to the Fall woman is to be seen as the inferior of man, being an image of the image of God. Together these elements amounted to a misogyny which, grounded in Eve, condemned all women: 'and you know that you are also Eve, God's judgement on this sex lives on in our age; the guilt necessarily lives on as well. You are the devil's gateway; you are the unsealer of the tree . . . because of your punishment, that is, death, even the Son of God had to die'.¹⁶ Such misogyny was to remain a persistent feature of Byzantium.¹⁷

The condemnation of women within the Biblical texts was matched by the separate discourse of an asexual ideal found within the same texts. In theory this ideal offered a way out of the misogynist perception of the sexual divide. The basis of this lay in Genesis 1, 27: 'So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them'. Similarly, Paul writes: 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Jesus Christ'.¹⁸ Both these passages suggest that in a state of grace the sexual divide ceases to exist. This theory of essential unity is developed into a theory of salvation in the patristic literature. Notable for this is the *Gospel of Thomas*: 'When you make the two one, and make the inside like the outside, and the outside like the inside,

15. *Corinthians* I, 11, 7.

16. Tertullian, *On the dress of women* I, 1, 2 (CSEL 70.59).

17. C. Galatariotou, 'Holy women and witches: aspects of Byzantine conceptions of gender', *BMGS* 9 (1984/5) 55-94, 55.

18. *Galatians* 3, 24.

and the upperside like the underside and (in such a way) that you make the man (with) the woman a single one, in order that the man is not the man and the woman is not the woman . . . then you will go into (the kingdom)'.¹⁹ This is echoed in Jerome's *Against Jovinian* of 393: 'Virgins begin to be on earth what others will be afterwards in heaven. If it is promised us that we shall be as the angels (among angels, however, there is no difference of sex), either we shall be without sex, as the angels are, or assuredly, as it is plainly attested, we may be resurrected in our own sex but shall not perform the sexual function'.²⁰ Here, the asexual state (virginity) is likened to the state of angels or alternatively de-sexualised beings. The absence of sexual distinction is understood as a correlate of a state of grace.

Therefore, in terms of the Biblical sources and in terms of their patristic followers, it can be seen that attitudes to women were essentially twofold. One view was that women were equivalent to Eve, the other view being that within a state of glory the sexual distinction was dissolved. These two discourses provoked separate reactions.

The misogynist discourse manifested itself in the attitudes towards women within society. Woman within Byzantine society was heir to a long tradition of relative seclusion.²¹ Chrysostom provides a statement of this position: 'Our life is customarily organised into two spheres: public affairs and private matters, both of which were determined by God. To woman is assigned the presidency of the household; to man all the business of state, the market place, the administration of justice, government, the military and all other social enterprises',²² and thus: 'a wife has just one purpose: to guard the possessions we have accumulated to keep a close watch on the income, to take charge of the household'. In this way Chrysostom outlines a clear demarcation of social roles between male and female. While this strong

19. Grant, *The secret sayings of Jesus* (London 1960) 75 (hereafter *Secret*).

20. *PL* 23.273A.

21. J. Herrin, 'In search of Byzantine woman: three avenues of approach', in *Images of women in antiquity*, ed. Cameron/Kuhrt (London 1983) 167-89, 169 (hereafter *Three Avenues*).

22. *The kind of women who ought to be taken as wives*, 4 (*PG* 51) 230.

dichotomy was undermined by the evidence of practice (see below), it nevertheless provided a repeated framework for Byzantine thinking on the sexes.

The assumed error of crossing the convention of sexual division is best illustrated in Procopios' portrayal of Theodora in the *Secret History*, where the Empress is condemned for bringing supposedly feminine traits into the realm of state affairs.²³ In section 15 of the *Secret History* Procopios outlined the Empress' love of indulgence only to complain: 'And though she had strayed thus into every path of self-indulgence for so great a part of the day, she thought fit to run the whole of the Roman Empire'.²⁴ Similarly, Procopios attributed the murder of Amalsuntha, daughter of the Gothic king Theodoric, to the jealousy felt by Theodora towards her.²⁵ In the *Wars* the same writer puts an expression of the attitude towards women in public life into the Empress' mouth: 'As to the belief that a woman ought not to be daring among men or to assert herself boldly among those who are holding back from fear, I consider that the present crisis does not permit us to discuss whether the matter should be regarded in this or in some other way'.²⁶ Only in the confusion of crisis can the Empress feel able to speak out in public. Procopios clearly treats Theodora within the categories that his society assigns to women.

In a similar vein Amalasuntha and the Empress Irene, who actually ruled the Empire as a woman alone for five years, are, when spoken of in an approving fashion, described in male language with male attributes.²⁷ This suggests that the office of the

23. Averil Cameron, *Procopius* (London 1986) 67-83 esp. 69.

E.A. Fisher, 'Theodora and Antonia in the *Historia Arcana*: history and/or fiction?' *Arethusa* 11 (1978) 253-80, provides an assessment of Procopius' attitudes to women throughout his literature. Fisher argues that the Empress is a special figure (259), but like Cameron the Empress is understood as a special *woman*.

24. Translation from the Penguin edition of the *Secret History*, tr. G. Williamson, 114. (Loeb ed. XV.9).

25. Loeb ed. XVI.1-5.

26. *Wars* I:XXIV.33, Loeb ed. H.B. Dewing (London 1971).

27. P. Speck, *Kaiser Konstantin VI* (Munich 1978) referring to a letter of Theodore the Studite, Letter 1, 7 (933A).

In the *Secret History* Amalasuntha is described as acting in an 'exceptionally virile manner' (Loeb ed. XVI.1).

Emperor or of a ruler was considered a male office. Any female occupant of that office could as a result only be defined in male terms. A comparison might be drawn with our contemporary discussion over how to address the chairman/chairperson/chairwoman/chair. Underlying this discussion is the recognition that there is a sexual bias in language. Such bias was also present in Byzantium. This can be seen in this use of male language to define the female occupant of a traditionally and linguistically male position.²⁸

The hierarchising of society in terms of gender, identified in the texts of men such as Chrysostom, was also structured into the legal position of women.²⁹ In the codification of the law produced under Justinian the division into public and private spheres and the authority of men over women were instituted. The law specifically denies women the right to have a role in local and central government, to perform civic duties, to act as a judge or to be a banker.³⁰ Further to this they could only partake in judicial proceedings if the case directly affected them. When involved in a case a second could stand in their stead or a part of the proceedings would take place in the woman's home. A woman could not be held in protective custody. Only in rare instances could a woman be condemned for ignorance of the law.³¹ Finally, in terms of the public situation of women, there was no place for a figure such as an Empress within the Byzantine law.³² This restriction from the public domain did not allow women greater power within the home. Within the home she was subject to her father before marriage and to her husband thereafter. Nor were husband and wife treated as equals, as the laws on adultery will suggest. A man could only be guilty of adultery if he committed it with a married woman, a woman was guilty regardless of her partner. An adulterous woman, unlike a man, was unable to re-

28. This is thoroughly investigated in Dale Spender, *Man-made language* (London 1985) in which the author analyses the gender bias in language and its implications.

29. J. Beaucamp, 'La situation juridique de la femme à Byzance', *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévales* 20 (1977) 145-176, 149.

30. *Digest* L, 17; XIII, 5; *Codex* X, 42, 9.

31. *Digest* III, 1, 1; III, 3, 54; *Codex* II, 12, 4; II, 12, 18; *Digest* XIII, 5.

32. Beaucamp, *art. cit.* 149.

marry. The inequality of marriage is again demonstrated in the way in which a woman marrying a social superior was elevated in her standing, whereas a woman marrying an inferior lost her status. Theoretically a woman was free once she became a widow.³³ There are many examples of the free ranging and powerful widow in this period and yet the husband remained a dominant feature in the widow's life.³⁴

In assessing the actual situation of women within this early Byzantine society there is the problem of a lack of evidence.³⁵ One aspect of this is that for the most part evidence only refers to exceptional women, elite figures such as Empresses, aristocratic figures and saints. Yet from the discourse underlying this data general conclusions about the place of women in Byzantium can be drawn from which an understanding of Byzantine women might be derived. Discussion within texts of specific women indicates that exceptions to the secluded image of women were not infrequent. The number of powerful Empresses produced by this society seems to belie the misogynist image that Byzantium has. At a perhaps more 'ordinary' level, there is much evidence of women controlling property. This situation should not be altogether surprising given the Chrysostom definition above. This control of property falls into two parts. First, women handed down property specifically through the female line.³⁶ Secondly, there is evidence that women as widows held control over family property. In 897 the Tzagastes family sold land to the monastery of St. Andrew at Peristera, the designated head of the family being the widow Georgia.³⁷ The evidence of extensive travel by women, best exemplified by the widow Aetheria and the circle of Roman women around St. Jerome, seems to deny the image

33. Nov 117c 8.9. F. Gorla, *Studi sul matrimonio dell' adultera nel diritto giustiniano e bizantino* (Turin 1975) 182-85, 228-51.

34. The inscription on the Turtura fresco is written by the son of the widow Turtura and treats her in terms of her husband, Obas, who had been dead for thirty-five years. For the text see Bagatti, *Il Cimitero di Commodilla* (Vatican City 1936).

35. Evidenced by the writers in 'Women and Monasticism' *BF* 11 (1985).

36. Herrin, *Three Avenues*, 174-79.

37. Herrin, *Three Avenues*, 177.

of women trapped in seclusion.³⁸ It is notable that women could also be well educated; St. Eugenia is reported to have amazed philosophers with her knowledge of Greek and Latin texts and her wisdom.³⁹ Byzantine woman was therefore apparently able to achieve a measure of autonomy.

Yet the apparent autonomy of Byzantine women was to an extent illusory. The representation of female Emperresses, the women with perhaps the greatest claims to autonomy within this society, compromises their womanhood. Surviving texts maintained the discourse that allotted to men the 'public' role in this society. Irene was praised for being manly and Procopios depicted Theodora as a woman intruding into the public affairs of men. The female Empress had no place in Byzantine law. At a different level of perception evidence regarding marriage reveals a strong patriarchal control. The case of St. Euphrosyne of Alexandria demonstrates the situation and suggests one means of escape:

Euphrosyne: 'I could have wished that I were able to go out from this vain world, but I fear that my father wishes to give me husbands because of the vain wealth of this world'.

Holy man: 'Nay, my daughter, let not a man dishonour thy body, and do not surrender such beauty to shameful passion, but be thou altogether in thy purity a bride to Christ, who is able to give thee instead of these transitory things the kingdom of heaven. Therefore shave thy head in secret and go to the monastery and thou shalt be saved'.⁴⁰

Euphrosyne is seeking to escape from marriage. For her the marriage is organised by her father and is oriented around 'the vain wealth of this world'. By way of a response to this analysis of the woman's place within society, the Holy man offers the asexual community of the monastery as the only means of escape. The model of autonomy ('be thou altogether in thy purity') apparently lies outside of society.

38. J. Wilkinson, *Egeria's travels* (London 1971) 20-23.

39. Smith-Lewis, *Select narratives of the holy women from the Syro-Antiochene or Sinai palimpsest*, Studia Sinaitica IX & X (London 1900) 2.

40. *ibid.*, 49.

The promise of the Church as the means of escape from society was offered to widows.⁴¹ Widows were often young. As a result, they suffered from a social and in some cases a practical need to re-marry. At one end of the scale there is the tale of Maria told by John Moschos.⁴² Having been widowed she seeks to marry a soldier, but he will not marry her as she has children. Maria's solution is to kill her children. It is a moral tale and so the soldier rejects Maria, but it serves to illustrate the potentially desperate situation of the widow. At the other end of the scale are those women able to resist second marriages. One of these, Marcella, is praised by St. Jerome in his epistle 127: 'When her mother Albina grasped at the chance to have an eminent guardian for the widow beyond the family circle, Marcella replied, "If I wished to marry rather than to dedicate myself to perpetual chastity, I would seek a husband, not an inheritance"',⁴³ The Church was identified as the means of escape from the limitations of the roles that women could perform within Byzantine society. Within the Church the asexual ideal, embodied in ascetic practice, offered to women (and implicitly men) the opportunity to transcend the sexual divide realised at the Fall. For Euphrosyne and Marcella chastity opened the way to salvation and escape from the world. Unfortunately this promise was not kept.⁴⁴

Asceticism was the path taken in the pursuit of the asexual ideal.⁴⁵ In theory it was a literal withdrawal from the world. This rejection of the material was intended to bring the practitioner into a greater proximity to God. Gregory of Nyssa's *De Virginitate* praises the ascetic ideal as part of the process of salvation, in effect a return to the asexual state of pre-Fall Paradise.⁴⁶ The

41. Herrin, *Three Avenues*, 179; *eadem*, 'Women and the Church in Byzantium', *Bulletin of the British Association of Orientalists* (1979).

42. Herrin, *Three Avenues*, 173.

43. E. Clark, *Women in the early church* (Delaware 1983) CSEL 56, 146.

44. On the relationship between theory and practice in Byzantine attitudes to women see: A. Laiou, 'The role of women in Byzantine society', *JÖB* 31, 1.1 (1981) 28-60, and L. Garland, 'The Life and ideology of Byzantine women', *B* 58 (1988) 361-93.

45. Bugge, *Virginitas* (The Hague 1975) 30.

46. D. Blank, 'The etymology of salvation in Gregory of Nyssa's "De Virginitate"', *Journal of Theological Studies* 37 (1986).

image of asceticism is tied to the angel because of its supposedly asexual nature. 'He who has chosen the angelic life has raised himself to an incorporeal manner of living, since he has surpassed the ordinary possibilities of human nature. For it belongs to the nature of the angels to be freed from the society of marriage and not let themselves be turned aside to the contemplation of any other beauty than that of the divine face'.⁴⁷ With this asexual theme running through asceticism it seems that a theoretically alternative and autonomous society was opened for women.

The reception of women within the Church, however, does not appear to have freed them of many of the constraints inherent within society. In particular the Church appears to have reinforced the sexual divide through its asexual policy. The most radical expression of this is to be found in the transvestite saints.⁴⁸ The reasoning behind transvestism can be found in the *Gospel of Thomas*: 'Simon Peter said to them, "Let Maricham go away from us. For women are not worthy of life". Jesus said, "Lo, I will draw her so that I will make her a man so that she too may become a living spirit which is like you men; for every woman who makes herself a man will enter into the kingdom of heaven"'.⁴⁹ This view is echoed in one of the lives of the transvestite saints, that of Eugenia: 'For by nature I am a woman. And I was not able to fulfil the desire of my soul regarding the fear of God, unless I changed myself into this chaste and honourable and excellent guise. And being a woman by nature, in order that I might gain everlasting life I became a man for a short time'.⁵⁰ These texts indicate that transvestism was a physical manifestation of the asexual ideal through the uniting of female flesh with male garb. But underlying this theory there is a re-assertion of male supremacy. The ascetic practice followed by these saints served to destroy the physical woman; fasting would stop the menstrual flow and wither the breasts. There is no evidence of male transvestism, a fact which implies that asex-

47. Basil of Caesarea *Sermo asceticus* II (PG 31) 873, tr. from Bugge, *op. cit.*, 32.

48. E. Patlagean, 'L'histoire de la femme déguisée en moine et l'évolution de la sainteté féminine à Byzance', *Studi Medievali* 17.2 (1976) 597-623.

49. Grant, *Secret*, 99.

50. Smith-Lewis, *op. cit.* 20.

uality was at root based on notions of a superior male spirituality that the woman must achieve prior to attaining the asexual ideal.

The sense of hierarchy maintained in the model of ascetic practice was echoed within the institutions of the Church. The Church was unable to create a truly asexual community. One example of this is provided in the life of Eugenia where the saint was offered the abbacy of the monastery in which she was living disguised as a transvestite: 'But the blessed Eugenia declined this, for her conscience admonished her that she was a woman, and it was not fitting that she should be commander (and) governor to the men of God'.⁵¹ The praised female type of humility was a hindrance to a woman in a position of authority within the Church.

Women were not necessarily encouraged by the church in their pursuit of asceticism. In his *letter* 262 St. Augustine admonishes Eccidia for leaving her adulterous husband in order to pursue an ascetic lifestyle: 'I am extremely grieved that you decided to behave toward your husband in such a way that the edifice of continence, which had begun to be raised in him, should have sunk into the wretched ruin of adultery by his slipping from perseverance . . . in his anger at you he was destructive to himself . . . the great evil occurred when you did not treat him with the moderation you ought'.⁵² Augustine is here blaming a wife for the return by her husband to adulterous habits of old. Presumably, the husband, in Augustine's eyes, cannot be held responsible for his own behaviour. It is for the wife to save the marriage, irrespective of her own wishes. This is a somewhat surprising position for Augustine to assume considering his statements elsewhere with regard to marriage: 'Therefore, whoever wishes to prepare himself here and now for that kingdom must hate, not the humans themselves, but those temporal relationships by which this life of ours is supported'.⁵³

Even when a woman had escaped from society, there was no guarantee that the Church would protect her against society's

51. *ibid.*, 13.

52. Clark, *op. cit.* (CSEL 57) 621.

53. *On the sermon on the mount* 1, 15, 40, CCL 35.44.

demands. Euphrosyne's final reason for becoming a transvestite reveals that the convent provided no safe haven for women: 'If it be that I am to go to a convent of women my father will never cease to seek till he has found me, and he will snatch me away by force from the convent on account of my betrothed. But I will put myself into a domicile of men in a place where no one will suspect me'.⁵⁴

The Church treated women within the hierarchical discourse found in the Biblical and patristic texts. The asexual ideal foundered on the model of the male image of the ascetic. There were only female transvestites. It was the woman's asexuality that withered through ascetic practice. In this way the Church did not differ from society in its attitude to the sexes. Not only were women different from men, but they were also the inferior sex. This structure of perceptions was apparent at every level of this society. Chrysostom's analysis of the distinction between the public male space and the private female space was applied by Procopios to the Empress Theodora. For him, the Empress was an intruder into the public realm of the state. It now has to be seen whether Procopios' (and his society's) perception of gender roles is to be found in the imagery of San Vitale.

In the discussion of these mosaics above it was intimated that the image of Theodora offers the greatest 'problems' in understanding these panels. Justinian and Theodora echo each other. They are dressed in imperial purple and are crowned. They are both haloed as a final emphasis on their shared status as imperial figures. Yet Theodora is given a number of extra props to aid the definition of her role in these images: the niche and her height. These additions serve to separate Theodora from the rest of her panel, unlike Justinian who is firmly set within his entourage, sharing their height and clearly participating in the ritual with them.

The differences in the representations of the imperial couple require explanation. The Justinian panel sets its actors against a simple gold background. This use of gold serves to dematerialise both space and time through offering no specific historic reference. The nature of this space is unclear and apart from the named

54. Smith-Lewis, *op. cit.*, 51-2.

figure of Maximian the actors represented can only be identified by their badges of office, thus undermining the specificity of portrayal. The fact that Maximian is the only named party is remarkable given that he is probably the only local figure represented in the panel. As this is the case it seems surprising that he should be singled out for identification. This might be in recognition of his role as the patron of the mosaic, just as Bishop Ecclesius is recognised as the patron of the building in the conch mosaic in this church. But the representation of Maximian is not that of him as a donor. He carries no gift. Rather he is holding a cross which marks him as a participant in the Little Entrance of the Liturgy. By this device he is set into the visual text of the Justinian panel (see below). We must then look for other reasons for this inscribed portrayal of the bishop. Here, I want to suggest that by naming the Bishop the designer of the mosaic has localised, both temporally and spatially, a concept of power. Maximian is then to be understood as forming a bridge between a concept of power and the actual experience of that power.

The concept of power represented in the Justinian panel is that of imperial rule. The figure identified as Justinian can in truth only be read as *an* Emperor, designated by the imperial purple, the crown and the halo. This figure is, in contrast to the Theodora figure, the same height as his companions. The Emperor is surrounded by soldiers, courtiers and priests. These figures serve to represent facets of imperial power: military strength, court based government and theological legitimisation.⁵⁵ Pictorially the Emperor is set among his companions. In part this is signalled by Justinian's attributes. He carries a paten and so assumes a priestly role. He wears the military chlamys and sports the tablion of senatorial rank. The Emperor is by these means represented as a composite of his companions. Like them, his distinction is the badge of office he wears. The person of the Emperor is not distinguished from them. This image can be understood less as an image of Justinian and rather more as a representation of the notion of imperial rule. Maximian is the local representative of

55. S. MacCormack, *Art*, 261-63.

this imperial power structure. As a figure recognizable to his congregation he can be understood as having a mediating role in this image. He localises the broader concept of imperial rule and affirms its presence in this recently recaptured capital of the West.

In contrast to the relatively simple structure of the Emperor's image the Theodora panel appears altogether less clear. She is set in a space defined by architectural features. It has been assumed that this space can be understood as an atrium through its fountain and doorway, although it could never be claimed that this has been made explicit. This lack of clarity acts to take the viewer away from a purely literal reading of this image.

The courtiers surrounding Theodora are less well defined than those found in the Justinian panel. The seven women, though lavishly dressed, cannot be distinguished in terms of office. Their male counterparts, however, do not sport the *tablion* which marks them as public officials. This ought not to be surprising given the 'private' female/'public' male definition of Byzantium. A badged uniform, as a public token of public office, cannot be worn by a female in this society. This exclusion of women from a public role is made explicit in the Theodora panel. The panel is of mixed sex, unlike the all male Justinian panel. It is possible, therefore, to contrast the manner in which the female actors and the male actors are represented. The men are badged. As such they have an identifiable public role. The women have no badge. It is not possible to define them in the same terms as the male figures. Apart from the Empress the women cannot be distinguished from one another in terms of status. The privileging of the male as the performer of a public role is underlined in this panel by the way in which the male actors are showing the way into the darkened doorway to the female actors.

Theodora receives an altogether different treatment from that of her female companions. In the first instance she is presented as a uniformed female. She wears the crown, the purple and the halo of her imperial rank. But in so doing she has broken with the non-uniform, non-public female role in this society. That this has presented the designer of the mosaic with problems appear evident. Mention has already been made of the niche used for Theodora but absent for Justinian, and the additional height of

the Empress. Both of these signal her separation from her retinue.

Before embarking on an analysis of the treatment of Theodora within her panel, a comparison of the clothing of the Emperor and Empress will suggest the framework within which these images are produced. The direct connection between Justinian and Theodora, the imperial uniform, is modified for Theodora. Her crown is far more luxurious than Justinian's. She has strings of pearls hanging down while his has only isolated jewels. Likewise Justinian's does not develop above its basic ring as Theodora's does. The additional luxuriance of Theodora's crown is carried down to the bejewelled shoulder decoration of her cloak. This additional luxuriance can be interpreted as an attempt to 'feminise' the uniform. The additional luxury of Theodora's cloak and crown can be compared with the contrast between the luxury of the female dress and the relative simplicity of the male dress in her panel. Theodora wears a long dress, unlike her female companions she does not wear a shroud. Instead she wears the male (and military) chlamys over her dress. Yet this chlamys is not equivalent to Justinian's. On his the Emperor wears a golden tablion, sharing with his courtiers a badge of office. Theodora, as a woman, cannot wear such a badge. Instead her rank is signalled through alternative means; she has an analogous image of the Magi sewn into the hem of her cloak. The use of this image not only serves to identify the imperial donation represented in the two panels (the donation of the chalice and the paten) with the donations of the Magi, but also unambiguously identifies Theodora as a figure of regal rank.⁵⁶ The common link of the imperial uniform between the Emperor and the Empress is not an equal one.

The inequality in the representation of the Emperor and Empress is given further expression in the use of the niche. The niche serves as a device for separating Theodora from her companions and for distinguishing her as an imperial figure. These are only partial interpretations of this iconography. For one thing

56. A. Grabar, *Christian Iconography* (London 1969) 44-45 discusses the regal nature of the Magi.

Theodora is not alone beneath her niche. To her right is a male figure, to her left is a female figure.

A comparison with the Justinian panel will guide the analysis of the use of the niche in the Theodora panel. It was stated above that Justinian has no niche. This is true. But just as Theodora is represented beneath an enclosed space, so too is Justinian. At the top of his panel are a series of rhomboid shaped turquoise areas. They form a line along the top of the panel with the central area being wedge-shaped. Each of these areas is marked by a black and white flash. Those to the right of the wedge carry this flash in the top right hand corner of their area. Those to the left of the wedge carry this flash in the top left. These markings appear to be crude representations of shading. The effect is to suggest that Justinian and his male companions are situated beneath an enclosing arc.⁵⁷ Theodora and her male and female companions are similarly positioned.

The interpretation of Theodora's niche is dependent upon the companions that she and Justinian have. Justinian is enclosed with all of his male retinue. These represent the different facets of his imperial power. They are the means by which Justinian's office is defined. In the case of Theodora her office cannot have the same means of definition. She is a woman holding public office and therefore a challenge to the public male discourse of this society. In part the difficulties of representing her as such are evidenced in the 'problematic' treatment of Theodora in contrast to the simpler treatment of Justinian. The Empress, the uniformed female, is a transgressor of the sexual discourse prevalent in this society. The transgressing nature of Theodora's role is made explicit in her being situated beneath the niche between a female and a male figure. Her status as a woman cannot be denied, nor can her status as a bearer of office. The designer of the mosaic has therefore made explicit her status as a transgressor of the perceptions of gender in this society through setting her between

57. A visual comparison for this type of shading can be made with the architecture of the panel of SS. Onesiphorus and Porphyrios in the dome of St. George, Thessaloniki. Colour plate in E. Kitzinger, *Byzantine art in the making* (London 1977) II, 52-53. Thanks to Henri Franses for pointing out the nature of this ceiling to me.

a male public office holder and a female without office — the two sides of Theodora.

Theodora's position within the image is expressive of her transgression. As the tallest figure, and the central figure, of her panel she marks an axis. To one side of this axis are males (who take the lead) to the other side females (who follow). She is the boundary dividing the sexes. As a boundary she occupies the paradoxical position of being of both sexes and of neither. The backdrop of this panel maintains this transgressing image of the Empress. Justinian's space is homogenous, if unidentifiable; Theodora's space presents us with the possibilities of both public and private space.⁵⁸ The procession across the panel has come from a recently unveiled entrance. The red, white and blue cloth is attached to an architrave in a similar manner to the fixing of the cloth in the darkened doorway. This cloth has been raised and draped over the columns in order to allow the passage of the Empress' procession. The need to raise the cloth suggests that this is a passage from an enclosed and private area, a women's space in the definition of this society. The procession then moves into an area of display, a niched area designed to emphasise the figure within. Here the Empress is revealed to the public gaze, crossing all the boundaries. The procession will then move into a darkened space, an entrance again suggestive of the private. We are given in Theodora's panel a rare glimpse of the ambivalent and transgressing role performed by the Empress in Byzantine society in the sixth century.

The perception of the Empress outlined above is echoed in a lengthy description of a work of art which portrayed Justinian and Theodora. The description is of the decoration of a room in the Chalke gate of the Imperial Palace in Constantinople.⁵⁹ The image dates to c540, the description to c554. The description comes from Procopios' *Buildings*:

58. For a more traditional discussion of the space in this panel see A. Stojakovic, 'La réalisation des intérieurs sur les mosaïques impériales de San Vitale', *Starinar* 20 (1969) 363-72.

59. Discussion in C. Mango, *The Brazen House* (Copenhagen 1959) 32-24.

On either side is war and battle and many cities are being captured, some in Italy, some in Libya; and the Emperor Justinian is winning victories through his general Belisarius, and the general is returning to the Emperor, with his whole army intact, and he gives him spoils, both kings and kingdoms and all things that are most prized among men. In the centre stand the Emperor and the Empress Theodora, both seem to rejoice and to celebrate victories over both the king of the Vandals and the king of the Goths, who approach them as prisoners of war to be led into bondage. Around them stands the Roman Senate, all in festal mood. This spirit is expressed by the cubes of the mosaic which by their colours depict exultation on their very countenances. So they rejoice and smile as they bestow on the Emperor honours equal to those of God, because of the magnitude of his achievements.⁶⁰

This description returns us to the points made above regarding the perception of gender roles in this society. In his description Procopios indicates that both Justinian and Theodora are present at the centre of the image. They receive the vanquished kings. But in his text Procopios appears disinclined to elaborate on Theodora's role in this mosaic. This is in contrast to his treatment of Justinian. For Procopios it is the Emperor who wins victories and it is the Emperor who receives 'honours equal to those of God, because of the magnitude of his achievements'. The Emperor's success in the male domain of war has brought him the praise of Procopios. The visual presence of the Empress is almost irrelevant to the gender based perception of this imperial image. The imperial mosaics in San Vitale should be set within the context of these attitudes towards the imperial office.

In the San Vitale panels Justinian is represented as the Emperor. He is distinguished from his companions by his uniform. This same uniform, his height and his participation within the First Entrance ritual sets the Emperor among his companions. They are all representatives of a patriarchal understanding of power. The public male role and the male language of power all reinforce this structure. The Empress Theodora transgresses the boundaries of this public male structure. She is a public female and as such contradicts the assumptions held about the imperial office in this society. The Justinian mosaic is a paradigm of imperial representation, fulfilling the expectations of the viewer. The Theodora panel has to compensate for the transgression of

60. Procopius, *Buildings* I.x.16-19. ed./tr. H.B. Dewing (Loeb ed. 1971).

Theodora into public affairs which so horrified Procopios. The Empress is dressed in adapted male clothing, she stands beneath a niche to emphasise her importance, she has additional height to distinguish her from her companions. These are male and female. She stands between them. Because of her office she is of both sexes and of neither. They define her two sides, the public and the private, the male and the female. The space in the panel re-affirms this interpretation through the use of curtaining. Theodora has entered from a hidden curtained space, she stands beneath a niche designed to honour her, she will pass on to a second curtained entrance, when once more she will be hidden from sight. Just as the image of Justinian at San Vitale fulfils the norms within which the Emperor was perceived, so too does the image of Theodora fulfil the norms within which the Empress was perceived.

Courtauld Institute

I would like to thank Janet Nelson, Lindy Grant and Anthony Bryer for providing opportunities for the reading of various versions of this paper. Special thanks must go to Liz James for discussion of aspects of feminism, and to Robin Cormack for first introducing me to 'The Age of Theodora'.



The Justinian panel, San Vitale, Ravenna



The Theodora panel, San Vitale, Ravenna

The Inauguration Anthem of Hagia Sophia Again

ANDREW PALMER

On Christmas Day, 1988, I received from Marc Deprez the draft of an article entitled *Noël et Hanoucah*, which threw some further light on the imagery used in the kontakion translated by me in *BMGS* 12. On p.146 I referred to 'a verbal reminiscence of the Feast of Booths', where the poet writes: *In celebrating the Word's divine sojourn in the Body may we, the children of his Church, be thatched with luminous virtues worthy of his grace, and may we prove, by divine illumination, a worthy dwelling-place of knowledge.* . . But I did not know why the Feast of Booths was especially relevant to the occasion of the kontakion, which was Christmas Day. It is common knowledge that Hanukkah, the Jewish festival of Light (Josephus, *Antiquities* xii 7, 7), coincides with Christmas on 25 Kislev (December), the winter solstice, a date justified by the commentators on the Talmud by reference to the twenty-fifth word in the Torah, which signifies 'light'. What I had not realized is that Hanukkah is called 'a Feast of Tabernacles in the month Kislev' (2 Maccabees 1:9, as translated in the New English Bible; cf. *ibid.*, 10:6, where Hanukkah is described as being celebrated in the manner of the Feast of Tabernacles or Booths). The fifty days between the two Feasts of Booths, Sukkot and Hanukkah, constituted at the same time the first and the eighth or last cycle in the liturgical year; the Christian Church adopted this same pattern, calling the first feast 'Christ the King' and the last 'Christmas', so that the time between was 'Advent', which signified both Christ's coming to the earth as a baby and his second coming. The Church Fathers were aware of this parallelism between the Jewish and the Christian liturgies: Gregory of Nyssa, in the Christmas sermon echoed in our kontakion (see p.147 of my article, with reference), says 'We celebrate today the mystery of the real construction of the

Booths'. The association of Booths and Light at Hanukkah can be discerned in the Christian image of the Light of the World being born as a baby in a dark cave. It suggested to the poet the paradox SHADE = LIGHT, which he exploits in the passage quoted above (*thatched with luminous virtues*). I am grateful to Marc Deprez for making me aware of these connections. The Jewish background is further documented in E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*, vol.1, revised and edited by G. Vermes and F. Millar (Edinburgh 1973) 163 note 65. Is it possible that this is how Christ's birth came to be situated, by western artists, in a thatched shed?

In addition, I should rectify one major error in my article in *BMGS* 12, p.131, which the reader will not correct easily for her- or himself. The translation of DALETH, the fourth strophe of the Syriac anthem, follows the London MS. To follow the text as edited on p.157 it should be corrected as follows: *For a wonder it surely is that, though small, it is like the wide world; the resemblance lies not in the scale, but in the design: it even has its own encircling 'Ocean'*. This correction only adds support to Lyn Rodley's commentary on p.158; but it makes me wish I had not written, on p.118, 'a more accurate translation is needed', in a passage where the tone now seems altogether too self-assured.

University of Groningen

The Metrical Structure of the Oral Decapentasyllable*

PETER MACKRIDGE

What Milman Parry saw as his 'historical method' in Homeric criticism¹ has paradoxically relieved students of the Greek folk song from the obligation to approach their subject of study from an *exclusively* genetic or 'etymological'² — in a word, historical — viewpoint. Instead of having to search for — or rather to speculate about — the origins of Greek oral poetry in the mists of antiquity³ or to assess the extent to which a song can provide reliable historical evidence concerning past events, we are free to turn our attention, as scholars such as Roderick Beaton (1980) and Grigoris Sifakis (1988) have done, to a synchronic study of the folk-song tradition, concentrating as much on the rules that generate the songs as on the significance of actual samples collected in the field (or in the scholar's study or the recording studio).

As far as the rules of composition are concerned, we should abandon the concept of 'conflation', substituting for it the concept of intertextuality, which, if it is valid for texts produced by

* I am grateful to Dr. Rosemary Bancroft-Marcus, Dr. David Ricks, and Professor Grigoris Sifakis for having read and discussed with me an earlier draft of this paper and for having suggested numerous improvements. Needless to say, all remaining drawbacks — particularly where I have ignored their advice — are entirely my own responsibility.

1. Parry set out his views in 'The Historical Method in Literary Criticism' (Parry 1971: 408-413), and applied the method in various works now collected in the same volume. For a reassessment of this method see Adam Parry's introduction to that volume, especially pp.xxx-xxxi and lviii-lix.

2. By an etymological view I mean the now outmoded assumption that, say, the 'meaning' of a 'historical' Greek folksong could be recuperated by taking it back to the historical event upon which, according to the folklorist, its original version was based.

3. Illuminating critical surveys of work done on the origins of the decapentasyllable have been carried out by M. Alexiou and Holton (1976) and by L. Politis (1981).

literate writers, is even more obviously applicable to oral literature. In the oft-quoted formulation of Julia Kristeva, 'every text is an absorption and transformation of a multiplicity of other texts' (Ducrot and Todorov 1981: 359). If this is true of works that have an author's name attached to them, how much more true must it be of oral poetry which is produced according to strict traditional conventions? According to this approach, it is futile to search for the origin of any particular song, or of the Greek folk-song tradition in general.

We must never forget that, as Michael Herzfeld has reminded us (1981; and in the present volume),⁴ the full meaning of a song cannot be recovered if one ignores the particular circumstances of its performance in its social context — what Anna Caraveli (1982) has suggestively called 'the song beyond the song'. Nor can we afford to ignore the musical aspects of the song's performance, which in many cases is linked also to the kind of dance it accompanied. Folk song is performance and process rather than text. As Ruth Finnegan said at our Colloquium, it is the text alone, and not the art form, that is represented by the words recorded on the page; and as one ethnographer has cautioned, 'Dissection does not recapitulate generation' (Tedlock 1977: 510).

Nevertheless the literary scholar and the linguist are justified in bringing their disciplines to bear on the texts of the Greek folk songs since the songs *have* an essential textual component, whether they are performed in the village square, the urban restaurant or the studio, or whether they lie inert, pinned to the page, beneath a lepidopterist's label that classifies and describes without telling us anything about the specimen's behaviour and its relationship with its habitat.

If I am at all qualified to talk about any aspect of the Greek folk song, it is only about the text — the 'nuclear text' (Smith 1977: 146) which, when the musical rhythm, the extrametrical initial syllables, repetitions, refrains and interpolations that mask

4. At our colloquium Herzfeld expressed the view that to treat folk songs as texts at all (which he condemned as 'bureaucratic violence') is to destroy their poetic qualities. I cannot agree. Literary analysis, unlike vivisection, leaves the analysed corpus intact. I should add that, unlike Herzfeld in the present volume, I am not talking primarily about poems improvised for specific occasions.

it in performance have been edited out, miraculously turns out to be composed in perfectly formed verses. In the textual study of the Greek folk song it matters little whether the singer memorizes or improvises: while this distinction is crucial to the Parry-Lord theory of oral-formulaic composition which states that all oral poetry is improvised (composed in performance), it is irrelevant to what I would call the 'poetic grammar'.⁵ As scholars of oral poetry have acknowledged, when traditional singers compose and/or perform they apply a set of rules (largely, but not exclusively, dictated by metre) in addition to those that control the grammar of their spoken language. These rules of poetic grammar, which ensure that the competent singer produces utterances that are acceptable with regard to the poetic language just as his/her spoken utterances are grammatically acceptable, are internalized in the same way as ordinary grammatical rules, and in an equally or almost equally unconscious manner. Today, despite the absence of an oral tradition as widespread and as rich as that of nineteenth-century Greece, we can still attempt to formulate a number of these special rules of poetic grammar, which will help us to understand how Greek folk songs were composed. It should be borne in mind, however, that I shall concern myself with the formal structures that enable meaning to be produced rather than with meaning itself.

There are several basic matters that I would like to see further investigated. Despite the remarkable similarities among songs from all over Greece and Asia Minor, we should be able to specify the distinctive formal characteristics of songs from each region.⁶ Also we need to have a more explicit account of certain technical matters such as the rules governing synizesis and hiatus, and the types of syntactical structure that may be interrupted at the mid-

5. 'Versification is the grammar of poetry': C.P. Cavafy, quoted by Peri (1989: 5).

6. Such an enquiry would cover themes and motifs (Saunier (1972) provides an illuminating instance of this) as well as technical questions such as the use of formulas and the types of metrical and syntactical structures preferred in each region (e.g. is there a marked predominance of oxytone or proparoxytone endings in the first hemistich in any region?; in which regions and in what metrical contexts is it possible for stress to fall on the third — or eleventh — syllable?). The metrical and syntactical consequences of the use of the various dialects also need further investigation.

line caesura and at the end of a line.⁷ We need to have the particular characteristics of rhymed distichs and of the Cretan *ρίμες* and Cypriot *ποιητάρικα* more finely distinguished from the rest of the Greek oral poetic tradition. And, within the 'demotic tradition' *par excellence* (Beaton 1980: 3), we need to locate the factors underlying the *predictability* of folk song — the factors that define the singer's and audience's *expectations* of the sort of thing that will come next once the performance of a song is under way. Lastly, it should be possible to distinguish which grammatical and semantic constraints are common to song and to speech, which are imposed by metre, and which are imposed by other conventions.

In this paper I shall concentrate on the metre of the Greek oral decapentasyllable and on how the grammar of the language is adapted to it by a number of additional constraints that dictate what the singer must or must not do. Far from rendering the composition of verses difficult, these constraints on the freedom of choice facilitated the production of formally acceptable songs by suggesting the sorts of things that might be said, together with appropriate ways of saying them.

If we are to talk about an *iambic* decapentasyllable at all, we should rid ourselves of the notion that this implies the presence of seven and a half metrically identical feet, each consisting of an unstressed syllable followed by a stressed one (cf. L. Politis 1981: 225; Garandoudis 1989: 100-1). The word 'decapentasyllable' means exactly what it says: it cannot consist of more or fewer than fifteen syllables. The chief way it can be divided up for analytical purposes is according to the caesura after the eighth syllable, which obligatorily separates the line into two phrases. Each of these hemistichs contains one obligatory stress, the first hemistich on either the sixth or eighth syllable⁸ and the second on the sixth (= fourteenth); in addition, each hemistich

7. A start was made in this direction by Kyriakidis (1978: 252-61), but his analysis needs considerable refinement.

8. Account will have to be taken of apparent exceptions such as the following, in which *both* the sixth *and* the eighth syllable are stressed:

Γεμίζουν τα βουνά φωνές και τα λαγκάδια δάκρυα
(Kapsomenos 1978: 38).

normally contains one other significant stress. The fact that all the obligatory stresses and the majority of the other significant stresses fall on even syllables has led traditional scholars to describe the metrical pattern as 'iambic'.⁹

The length of the decapentasyllable, like other indigenous modern Greek verse forms, is determined by a fixed number of syllables, while its rhythm obeys rules for the placement of stressed and unstressed syllables which allow a significant degree of flexibility. Any search for the historical origins of the decapentasyllable should not blind us to the fact that the metrical pattern of this verse is generated by *pairing, coupling or mating* (ταίριασμα). The metre may be conceived of as a matrix with sixteen positions, of which the last is always left unfilled; the sixteenth position is like a musical rest, and it serves to separate the verse from the following one: it also perhaps discourages enjambement. The sixteen positions are divided into two groups of eight, each group being governed by identical rhythmical rules, except that while the first hemistich may receive its final stress on either the sixth or the eighth syllable, the second may be stressed only on the sixth, since the eighth position remains empty. The sixteen notional syllables of the line may be seen as being *mathematically* generated by twos: $2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2$, or alternatively $2 \times (2 \times (2 \times 2))$ — or the square of the square of two. This pairing of pairing of pairing of pairs of syllables is analogous to the syntactical and/or semantic parallelism or equivalence between hemistichs in Greek oral poetry, in which phrases are often paired together in a way similar to that found in the poetry of many traditional cultures.¹⁰ The

9. In a 1948 review of Baud-Bovy (1936), Kyriakidis noted the following: that the decapentasyllable consists of four 'feet', each of four syllables; and that only one stress is necessary in each of these feet, and it may fall on any one of the four syllables (Kyriakidis 1978: 307; cf. L. Politis 1981: 225). Further investigation will show whether the concept of the 'foot' is useful for an investigation into Greek oral metrics. At all events, the natural two-beat rhythm of Modern Greek is clearly indicated by the 'enclisis' rule — applicable in all dialects except those of the south-eastern region and Asia Minor — which converts *táloyomu* to *táloyómu*.

10. Jakobson (1966) lists the following poetic traditions among those that he terms 'parallelistic': ancient Chinese and Hebrew, Vedic, Finnish, Turkic, and (among modern Indo-European cultures) Russian.

rhymed distich simply takes the process a stage further by pairing verses. As for the 'rule of three' (Romaïos 1963: see my example (5) below), this can easily be explained by a pattern of two equal elements of which the first is subdivided into two.¹¹

The typical line tends to contain four 'metrical words'. I now wish to elucidate what I mean by the terms 'metrical word'¹² and 'significant stress'. It seems probable that the oral poet or singer does not start to compose a verse with a pattern of fifteen syllables in his mind. Rather, he builds it up in stages out of what I would call 'metrical words' (which could alternatively be termed 'stress-groups' or 'syllabic groups'¹³). Each of these metrical words consists of a series of morphemes that make up the metrical equivalent of the 'phonological word', that is a series of syllables constituting a significant word (see below) together with its accompanying proclitics and enclitics, with stress falling on only one of these syllables.¹⁴ There is evidence that illiterate and semi-literate Greek-speakers perceive discourse to be divided into groups of syllables which may often make up a unit larger than a 'dictionary word': thus, e.g., 'η κόρη μου', which we see as three words, may be conceived of and written (with due allowance for misspelling) as 'ηκόρημου' because it is felt that, when pronounced, all the unstressed syllables are subject to the dominance of the single stressed syllable: this is the phonological word.¹⁵ The metrical word is distinguished from the phonological word only by the fact that the former is bound by additional rules that

11. Morgan (1983: 50) has called this 'the reconciliation of a triple pattern to a duple pattern'.

12. By coincidence Spyridis (1983: 211) also uses the term 'metrical word'; but in his analysis this is a *musical* concept. The numbers of words per line and per couplet listed by Philippides (1986: 165-70) for *The Sacrifice of Abraham* are useless for a comparative study of the oral decapentasyllable, since her definition of 'word' takes no account of phonological or metrical words.

13. 'Stress-group' is the term employed by the translator of Žirmunskij (1966: 84). Lord uses the terms 'accentual group' (1960: 38) and 'word boundary pattern' (1960: 38, 56) for the same phenomenon.

14. But stress falls on two syllables in phonological words in which the enclisis rule operates: see footnote 9.

15. This is often the case with Makriyannis. L. Politis (1983: 13) quotes the following example: 'νατοςβουθισον ιπρασι νακαμον τοσκακοςτος σκοπος' (i.e. 'να τους βοηθήσουν οι περιρασμοί να κάμουν τους κακούς τους σκοπούς').

suit it to the metre. The stress on the phonological word (which we may think of as a phrase-stress rather than a word-stress) plays the same role in speech as the stress on the metrical word plays in decapentasyllabic verse, where it provides what I have called 'significant stress'.¹⁶

A metrical word normally has as its nucleus one member of one of the major word classes: these nuclear words are mostly nouns and verbs, but they may be adjectives, adverbs, numerals, and emphatic pronouns, and they may be accompanied by an array of unstressed articles, prepositions, non-emphatic pronouns, and conjunctions:¹⁷ thus the 'clitics' consist of what grammarians call 'function words' or 'grammatical words' as opposed to 'lexical words', which bear the greater semantic load. A metrical word cannot consist of a single syllable, since in Modern Greek monosyllables normally have no 'integrity' within a phrase, but attach themselves to other words.

The majority of hemistichs in a decapentasyllabic line consist of two metrical words (although the proportion of second hemistichs containing two metrical words is lower than that of first hemistichs). As for the number of syllables, a first hemistich made up of two metrical words may be structured in any of the following ways: 4 + 4, 5 + 3, 3 + 5, 2 + 6, or 6 + 2. The second hemistich may consist of: 3 + 4, 4 + 3, 2 + 5, or 5 + 2. Within these metrical words, the stress may fall on any one syllable (within certain practical constraints), as long as the rules for final stress in each hemistich are adhered to. Thus the number of different permutations of metrical words according to number of syllables and position of stress is considerable, and the traditional conventions provide a high degree of flexibility.¹⁸

16. To say that a typical oral decapentasyllable contains four metrical words (two in each hemistich) is to say that a line contains four *lexical* words (as distinct from 'grammatical' words), each of which bears a significant stress.

17. In her discussion of phonological words, Warburton (1970: 45-7) describes proclitics and enclitics as 'unstressed monosyllabic morphemes'. In doing so she fails to account for the two-syllable enclitic in phrases such as *φα τὸνε* (*fátone*). For our purposes, moreover, a number of two-syllable 'grammatical words' (including pronouns such as *ὅτις* and conjunctions such as *ὅταν*) may be treated as proclitics.

18. Nevertheless the oral decapentasyllable is far less flexible than the Homeric hexameter because of the invariable position of the caesura and the small amount of variation permitted in the position of the final stress of each hemistich.

Two lines may serve as examples of some of the most frequently found hemistich patterns (the division into metrical words is indicated in a loose phonetic transcription):

- (1) γιατί κοιμούνται μοναχά και συντροφιά δεν έχουν
(Saunier 1983: 28)
jatikimúnde monaxá kesindrofjá denéxun
- (2) αλησμονώ και χαίρουμαι, θυμιούμαι και λυπιούμαι
(Saunier 1983: 33)
alizmonó kexérume θimjúme kelipjúme

In the first hemistich of the first line the syllabic pattern is:

oooóo ooó (5 + 3, with stresses on 4 and 8),

while in the second line the first hemistich is divided thus:

oooó ooóo (4 + 4, with stresses on 4 and 6).

As for the second hemistichs, we find in the first line,

oooó ooó (4 + 3, with stresses on 4 and 6, i.e. as the previous example but without the final syllable),

and in the second line,

ooó ooóo (3 + 4, with stresses on 2 and 6).

I have said that most hemistichs consist of two metrical words. The second most common pattern is one in which the first hemistich contains *three* lexical words; in most cases one of these three components (commonly, but not necessarily, a verb) is either repeated or understood in the second hemistich.¹⁹ For example:

- (3) κάνει σταφύλι ραζακί και το κρασί μοσκάτο
(Saunier 1983: 211)
kàni stafíli razakí ketokrasí moskáto

This is one of the ways in which the second hemistich may be semantically and syntactically linked to the first. What is happening here is that contrastive emphasis is placed on the nouns and their modifiers, but not on the verb, which does not need to be repeated in every phrase in which it is acting: it can be con-

19. Sifakis (1988: 154ff.) analyses the different syntactical and semantic varieties of lines whose first hemistich contains three lexical words.

sidered as not bearing 'significant stress'; either it does not constitute a metrical word on its own, or it forms a 'weak metrical word'. The lighter emphasis on *kàni* is indicated here by the use of a grave accent instead of an acute; but it must be understood that we are talking here about semantic emphasis, not phonetic stress.

The equivalence between the omission of the verb in the second hemistich and its repetition is obvious if one compares the following variant of example (3):

- (4) κάνει σταφύλια ρατζακιά, κάνει κρασί μοσκάτο
(Akadimia 1962: 440).

kàni stafílja radzakjá kàni krasí moskáto

This pattern is frequently found in the 'tricolon' or 'rule of three' structure exemplified in the following, where the verb governs three object phrases:

- (5) πήρα την πλάκα πεθερά, τη μαύρη γης γυναίκα,
κι αυτά τα λιανολίθαρα αδέρφια και ξαδέρφια
(N.G. Politis 1914, no.42).

píra timbláka peθερά timavrijís jinéka
kjaftà taljanolíthara adérfja keksadérfja

The phrase 'timavrijís jinéka' and the phrase that takes up the whole of the second line are dependent upon the verb 'píra' in the same way as 'timbláka peθερά' is. The second hemistich of the first line consists of two metrical words. The first ('timavrijís') may be considered as a single metrical word because of the stereotyped collocation of the particular adjective and noun, in which the epithet is not denotative but connotative.²⁰

20. Other examples include ψιλή φωνή, χρυσός σιτός, κόρη ξανθή, and the two in the following line:

θέλει κι ένα μικρό παιδί, κρύο νερό να φέσει (Saunier 1983: 69).

But such collocations — called 'phrase-groups' by Zirmunskij (1966: 224) — are not confined to nouns accompanied by adjectives: there are also noun- + -noun phrases. The characterization of a phrase as a single metrical word may depend on its paradigmatic relationship with other metrical words: in the lines quoted in Sifakis (1988: 103-4) the phrase του ρήγα ο γιος constitutes a single metrical word, just like κι η λυερί, τσ' η αγαπώ, and κι η μάνα ντως, since each of these phrases consists of the same number of syllables, stands in the same position in the line and plays an equivalent semantic and syntactic role.

Again, the same phenomenon may occur even when a word that does not stand in contrast to any other element of the discourse is repeated:

- (6) Πήραν την Πόλη, πήραν την, πήραν τη Σαλονίκη
πήραν και την Αγία-Σοφιά, το μέγα μοναστήρι.
(Akadimia 1962: 125)

pìran timbóli pírandin píran tisoníki
píran ketinajasofjá toméya monastíri

Whether the first occurrence of the verb 'pìran' is considered as not forming a metrical word on its own, or as forming a 'weak metrical word', the important point is that the tripartite structure of the first hemistich in the first line of (5) and (6) contains a signal to the singer and his audience that the verb will be repeated (or understood) in the following hemistich(s).

Lastly, in example (5), we find another common phenomenon: the first hemistich of the second line appears to consist of only *one* metrical word (unless we count 'kjaftá' as a metrical word). This phenomenon occurs particularly when a compound word takes up so much of the hemistich that there is no room for another metrical word, e.g.:

- (7) και το μικρό Βλαχόπουλο, οκαστροπολεμίτης
(N.G. Politis 1914, no.70).

ketomikró vlaxópulo okastropolemítis

The reason for this is simply that most of these overlong words are poetic compounds not used in normal speech, and in any case the singer is perhaps aware of their derivation from two separate stressed words, which may be considered to be latent in his consciousness.²¹

Metrical words are not simply phonological and syntactical units; they are also units of sense. They are the units which the singer strings together to make a song, whether (s)he memorizes or improvises, or combines memorization with improvisation. Metrical words are the building blocks of the verse — although

21. S. Alexiou (1985: xvi) provides examples of double stresses written on compound verbs in the Escorial manuscript of Digenis Akritis.

the metaphor is inexact, since metrical words are more elastic than stones or bricks, and they do not require mortar to hold them firmly together. Metrical words, just like words in normal speech, inflect according to their syntactical and phonological context; this accounts for the slight variation according to context that is observed in otherwise identical phrases used over and over again in the same song or in different songs. But it may be that what the singer remembers is often not the actual words but the syllabic and accentual patterns into which words may be fitted.

The rules governing the internal structure and the combination of metrical words need to be considerably refined, along with most of the rules of Greek oral poetic grammar, and this clearly requires the aid of a computer to process a large corpus of song-texts.²² When this has been done, however, I believe we shall have a useful tool for the structural analysis of Greek oral poetry, but also for assessing the degree of 'orality' in medieval and modern texts that we know to be *written*, and in those whose 'oral/literate' status is in doubt.

For instance, we shall become more aware of how Solomos, the reanimator of the Greek language and of Greek poetry in the nineteenth century, used to break the rules of oral poetry, in a subtle or blatant manner, when he composed his decapentasyllables.²³ The line,

(8) Τα μάτια η πείνα εμαύρισε' στα μάτια η μάνα μνέει
(Solomos 1961: 215)

tamátja ipína emávriσε stamátja imána mnéi,

22. A computer-assisted study of Greek folk songs is at present being carried out by Jim Kelly at King's College, London. Prombonas (1985) has nevertheless already provided a wealth of useful material for the comparative study of the Escorial *Digenis Akritis* and the folksongs.

23. Chatziyakoumis (1968: 124-78) makes a valuable analysis of Solomos's use of poetic material taken from oral sources, but says nothing specific about the poet's subtle *technical* transformations of this material. Solomos himself, in his 'Thoughts' on his poem 'Οι ελεύθεροι πολιορκημένοι', comments on a French quotation on musical theory and notes the tendency towards pairing in the structure of the Greek folksong (the passage is given complete with the slips of Solomos's pen): 'C'est que toutes les phrases sont carrées (le frasi musicali) c'est a dire de quatre mesure chacune, et que la succession des phrases fasse toujours un nombre paire. — Qui pensa al verso Greco volgare. credo che sia identico.' (Solomos 1964: 472).

contravenes the principle that one of three lexical words in the first hemistich must be omitted, or understood, or repeated in *exactly* the same syntactical structure in the second (contrast 'tamátja' with 'stamátja'); there is also a more extensive use of synizesis here than is permitted in Greek oral poetry. By contrast, every word in the following line bears contrastive stress:

(9) Αραπιάς άτι, Γάλλου νους, βόλι Τουρκιάς, τόπ' Άγγλου
(Solomos 1961: 238),

arapjás áti γálu nús vóli turkjás tóρ ánglu

This line simply packs in more lexical and metrical words (i.e. more informational content) than oral poetry would allow.

St. Cross College, Oxford

References

- Akadimia Athinon. 1962. *Ελληνικά δημοτικά τραγούδια (εκλογή)*, I (Athens).
 Alexiou, M. and Holton, D. 1976. 'The origins and development of "politikos stichos"', *Mandatophoros* no.9 (November 1976): 22-34.
 Alexiou, S. 1985. *Βασίλειος Διγενής Ακρίτης* (Athens).
 Baud-Bovy, S. 1936. *La Chanson populaire grecque du Dodécanèse. I: Les Textes* (Paris).
 Baud-Bovy, S. 1973. 'Η επικράτηση του δεκαπεντασύλλαβου στο ελληνικό δημοτικό τραγούδι', *Ελληνικά* 26: 301-13.
 Beaton, R. 1980. *Folk Poetry of Modern Greece* (Cambridge).
 Caraveli, A. 1982. 'The song beyond the song: aesthetics and social interaction in Greek folksong', *Journal of American Folklore* 95: 129-58.
 Chatziyakoumis, E.K. 1968. *Νεοελληνικά πηγαί του Σολωμού* (Athens).
 Ducrot, O. and Todorov, T. 1981. *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Sciences of Language* (Oxford).
 Garandoudis, E. 1989. *Αρχαία και νέα ελληνική μετρική: ιστορικό διάγραμμα μιας παρεξήγησης* (Padua).
 Herzfeld, M. 1981. 'An indigenous theory of meaning and its elicitation in performative context', *Semiotica* 34: 113-41.
 Jakobson, R. 1966. 'Grammatical parallelism and its Russian facet', *Language* 42: 399-429.
 Kapsomenos, E.G. 1978. *Το ελληνικό δημοτικό τραγούδι: η αισθητική, ο μύθος και η ιδεολογία του. Πανεπιστημιακές σημειώσεις* (Rethymno).
 Kyriakidis, S.P. 1978. *Το δημοτικό τραγούδι: συναγωγή μελετών* (Athens).
 Lord, A.B. 1960. *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
 Makriyannis. 1983. *Οράματα και θάματα* (Athens).
 Morgan, G. 1983. 'Butz triads: towards a grammar of folk poetry', *Folklore* 94: 44-56.
 Parry, A. 1971. *The Making of Homeric Verse: the Collected Papers of Milman Parry* (Oxford).

- Peri, M. 1989. 'Εισαγωγή', in Garandoudis 1989: 5-23.
- Philippides, D.L. 1986. *The Sacrifice of Abraham on the Computer* (Athens).
- Politis, L. 1981. 'Νεώτερες απόψεις για τη γέννηση και τη δομή του δεκαπεντασύλλαβου', *Πρακτικά της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών* 56: 211-28.
- Politis, L. 1983. Prologue to Makriyannis 1983.
- Politis, N.G. 1914. *Εκλογαί από τα τραγούδια του ελληνικού λαού* (Athens).
- Prombonas, I.K. 1985. *Ακριτικά, Α'* (Athens).
- Romaïos, K. 1963. *Ο 'νόμος των τριών' στο δημοτικό τραγούδι* (Athens).
- Saunier, G. 1972. 'Le Combat avec Charos dans les chansons populaires grecques. Formes originelles et formes dérivées. Etude thématique', *Ελληνικά* 25: 119-52 and 335-70.
- Saunier, G. 1983. *Το δημοτικό τραγούδι: της ξενιτιάς* (Athens).
- Sifakis, G.M. 1988. *Για μια ποιητική του ελληνικού δημοτικού τραγουδιού* (Iraklio).
- Smith, J.D. 1977. 'The singer or the song? A reassessment of Lord's "oral theory"', *Man*, vol.12, no.1 (April 1977): 141-53.
- Solomos, S. 1961. *Άπαντα. Τόμος πρώτος: Ποιήματα* (Athens).
- Solomos, D. 1964. *Αυτόγραφα έργα* (Thessaloniki).
- Spyridis, C.C. 1983. *Μαθηματική μελέτη της δομής των ελληνικών δημοτικών καλαματιανών τραγουδιών και αντικειμενική καταγραφή μονοφωνικής μουσικής σε μουσική σημειογραφία* (Thessaloniki).
- Tedlock, D. 1977. 'Toward an Oral Poetics', *New Literary History* 8: 507-19.
- Warburton, I.P. 1970. *On the Verb in Modern Greek* (Bloomington).
- Žirmunskij, V. 1966. *Introduction to Metrics: the Theory of Verse*. Translated by C.F. Brown (London, The Hague and Paris).

**The Oxford Colloquium on
Orality in Medieval and
Modern Greek Poetry**

Edited by
PETER MACKRIDGE

Orality in Medieval and Modern Greek Poetry: Introduction

A colloquium under the above title was held in Oxford on May 12-13, 1989, under the auspices of the British association of university teachers of Modern Greek studies known as SCOMGIU (Standing Committee on Modern Greek in the Universities). The following articles represent a selection of the papers given at this colloquium, some printed with minimal alterations (thus preserving some traces of their oral performance) and others extensively rewritten.

‘What is orality — if anything?’ asks Ruth Finnegan provocatively in her title. The term seems to be given a distinct meaning by each group of people who use it. Contrasted with literacy — as in Walter Ong’s title (1982) — it is frequently used as a non-pejorative term to refer to the condition of non-literacy and to the modes of verbal communication practised by non-literate communities. Indeed, in a thought-provoking book the late Eric Havelock wrote that, by definition, orality — which he opposed to *textuality* (1986: 16), as does Tziovas (1989) — refers to non-literate societies (65).

The term ‘orality’ is frequently used by Classicists. A long-running debate in the correspondence columns of the *Times Literary Supplement* in the summer of 1989, entitled ‘Orality and Literacy’, concerned the question whether the Greeks, by adding signs for vowels to the North Semitic script which they adapted for their own language, had created the first true alphabet, or whether the Semitic people from whom they took their script should take the full credit for this invention. To Homerists, however, ‘orality’ means the arguments of those (the so-called ‘oralists’) who argue that the Homeric poems were composed without the aid of writing. The theoretical basis of these arguments, which were given a considerable boost by the work

of Milman Parry,¹ has been subjected to rigorous critical scrutiny in recent years, for instance by Michael Lynn-George (1988) in his review article on Geoffrey Kirk's oralist commentary on the first four books of the *Iliad*.

A book by Ruth Finnegan, whose title clearly represents a provocative reversal of Ong's, has taken issue with the oral-literate dichotomy, which implies that writing kills oral literary expression (1988: 122). Instead she suggests ways in which orality and literacy coexist and interpenetrate in many societies. At our colloquium we were discussing a society in which orality and textuality are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

Medieval and modern Greece is a highly appropriate context in which to observe oral-literate interaction at work. Here we are not dealing with a pre-literate society, but with one in which literacy and a literate culture have constantly existed, but — until recently — have been the domain of a very small group. The acceptance of the idea that literacy is the privilege of a small élite has underpinned the continued use, right up to the last couple of decades, of a written idiom whose vocabulary and grammar are distinguished from speech by the retention of ancient features which had disappeared from the spoken language. The Greek language controversy, at least in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries when it became most heated and urgent, can be usefully seen in terms of an 'oral-literate' debate.

The divide between oral and literate culture has been more obvious in Greece than in most European countries because of the dogged adherence of a small group of literate people to the language and culture of their ancient past, but equally because of the extraordinarily privileged status accorded to oral culture by another group of literate Greeks who gained dominance from

1. Scholars of medieval Greek verse were slow to take up the challenge thrown down by Albert Lord in his formulaic analysis of *Digenis Akritis* (Lord 1960: 207-20). The first such study, as far as I know, was Michael Jeffreys' painstaking analysis of the *Chronicle of the Morea* (1973). Jeffreys claimed to have demonstrated that the *Chronicle* contained signs of oral-formulaic composition. But he restricted the term 'formula' to cover only literal repetitions, which — as Grigoris Sifakis remarked at our colloquium — can be seen as clichés rather than formulas; to me they appear to be more characteristic of (poorly) written verse than of oral poetry.

the 1880s onwards (see, for instance, Tziovas 1989). Nevertheless, oral-literate interaction has shown itself in two chief ways in Greece. First, the liturgy and bible readings heard in the Greek Orthodox Church have ensured that non-literate Greek-speakers have been in constant contact with the written word in an archaic form; in modern times, too, the presence of readers of *katharevousa* and of ancient Greek in the community has left its mark on the language of people who have never formally learned these forms of Greek. Secondly, from about the twelfth century onwards, a number of literate Greeks have sought to combine orality and literacy by writing in a language and style that welcome the influence of the spoken and sung word; most of such literature, until the last century, was written in the characteristic fifteen-syllable verse-form of Greek folk song, and although it has not always attempted actually to imitate the language of oral poetry, it has always employed a considerable proportion of features characteristic of the spoken language (see Eideneier 1985). There are also cases — such as sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Cretan literature — in which poems (or parts of poems) written by literate authors under the influence of oral modes of expression have been taken up and transmitted orally by non-literate people. Lastly there is the phenomenon of the modern Cypriot ποιητάρηδες, who compose for the most part orally (but are influenced by the language of literate people) and have their songs printed for sale after their performances (see Beaton 1987).

Now whereas those who wrote in archaic Greek had a wealth of prestigious genre models, both in verse and in prose, which they could imitate, from the beginnings of vernacular Greek writing in the late Byzantine period to the end of the nineteenth century those who wished to write in a more 'oral' variety of Greek had only *song* that they could recognize as an artistically organized, albeit unwritten, use of language, conforming to strict rules of composition, whose precedent they could follow.

While speech could be said to be the 'unmarked' use of language, singing and writing are 'marked' uses. The explicit references to writing and singing in the oral and literate poetry of medieval and modern Greece would provide fruitful material for an investigation into the various connotations of these modes

of linguistic expression, whether they are mentioned in isolation or placed in complementary or antithetical juxtaposition. In modern times Greek poets have often tended to describe their poetry as 'song', while many Greek authors have shown themselves to be somewhat ashamed of being writers rather than singers: a well-known example of what might be termed 'the anxiety of writing' is that of Kazantzakis, who after failing as a modern bard to find an audience for his sequel to Homer's *Odyssey*, constantly piles abuse on himself, through the mouth of his spontaneous oral hero Alexis Zorbas, for being a bookworm.

*

The programme of the colloquium was organized around the complementary concepts of the 'oral-literate divide' and 'oral-literate interaction'. As Finnegan puts it in her contribution, 'orality' was a convenient standard under which to rally speakers at an academic conference. Most speakers were perhaps not talking much about 'orality', but rather about 'oral' features in literate poetry. 'Oralness' (as Finnegan prefers) was nevertheless like a ribbon running through the colloquium, gradually twisting over on itself as it went on, so that by the end the other reverse side was showing.

Ruth Finnegan's robust paper opened the proceedings by emphasizing the difference between attitudes towards texts as finished products and the study of the process underlying them. Both she and Michael Herzfeld stress the importance of the audience and the circumstances of performance of an oral 'text' and of the conventions according to which a song or story is produced. Herzfeld also treats orality and literacy as strategies employed by the members of a community rather than as abstract concepts.

Rockerick Beaton and David Holton cite references to writing and speaking as well as addresses to the reader or audience in a variety of texts. Beaton assesses the evidence for separate stages of oral composition, performance, and transmission in Byzantine vernacular texts, especially of the fourteenth century. Holton too deals with literacy as strategy, but concentrates on the 'oral

residue' — or at least the signs of an awareness of orality — in certain Cretan narrative poems of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

My own piece perhaps suggests that oral poetry, far from being the spontaneous outflow of unadorned emotion, is potentially as complex a linguistic construct as written poetry. Finally Sarah Ekdawi and Christopher Robinson address the subject of 'aurality' — the presence of aural features — in twentieth-century Greek poetry. From a study of non-literate verbal art, we have come to the reverse face of the ribbon: literate poetry that is nostalgic for the oral.

What has not been said about orality in medieval and modern Greek poetry in these papers? For a variety of reasons several of the papers delivered at the colloquium could not be published here. But some aspects of the subject were not covered at all. No mention was made of drama, for instance; and, of the Greek poets for whom the aspiration towards orality constituted a central feature of their poetics, a yawning gap is left by the omission of any piece on Solomos or Palamas, and even Seferis, Ritsos, and Elytis.

During the discussion at the end of the colloquium Roderick Beaton posed the question whether Greek culture is more or less oral than that of other societies. He also asked whether lessons concerning the oral-literate interaction can be learned from the Greek experience and applied elsewhere. These are fruitful avenues of comparative study, which I hope will be pursued further. As for Michael Herzfeld's final query in the discussion — whether Greek material can help us to deconstruct the term 'orality' — those papers that touch on the interaction between oral and written modes of communication go some way towards breaking down the binary opposition between the reified concepts of orality and literacy — an antithesis that has perhaps by now outlived its usefulness.

PETER MACKRIDGE

References

- Beaton, R. 1987 'Modern ποιητάρηδες and medieval poetry in vernacular Greek', *Πρακτικά Β' Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου* (Nicosia), III, 485-94.

PETER MACKRIDGE

- Eideneier, H. 1985. 'Ο προφορικός χαρακτήρας της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας', *Δωδώνη* 14:39-53.
- Finnegan, R. 1988. *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication* (Oxford).
- Havelock, E. 1986. *The Muse Learns to Write: Reflections on Orality and Literacy from Antiquity to the Present* (New Haven and London).
- Jeffreys, M.H. 1973. 'Formulas in the Chronicle of the Morea', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 27:164-95 (now in Jeffreys, E.M. and M.J., *Popular Literature in Late Byzantium* [London 1983]).
- Lord, A.B. 1960. *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Mass., and London).
- Lynn-George, M. 1988. 'What seas, what shores: Homeric studies after orality', *Comparative Criticism* 10:287-312.
- Ong, W. J. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: the Technologizing of the Word* (London and New York).
- Tziovas, D. 1989. 'Residual orality and belated textuality in Greek literature and culture', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 7:321-35.

What is Orality — if Anything?

RUTH FINNEGAN

‘A challenging start to the Colloquium’ was what the organiser asked for, in the form of a critique of one of its key terms. This is what this paper endeavours to supply. I suspect it has turned out not quite as provocative as the title sounds, but it does attempt to provide some critical assessment of, and background to, the much-discussed concept of ‘orality’, presented from the viewpoint of an anthropologist long interested in the study of oral literature and poetry. Most of the discussion will be in general terms, but I will illustrate my points from time to time by examples from my own fieldwork in West Africa.

‘Orality’, together with the adjectival ‘oral’, is a term now to be found quite widely in scholarly writing, not only in the classic study of Homeric texts (where it has of course been particularly influential, and where, I believe, I first consciously encountered it) but also across a whole range of disciplinary — and inter-disciplinary — contexts. It appears in the work of historians, literary and linguistic scholars, folklorists, anthropologists, biblical scholars, and interdisciplinary specialists in a whole series of historical periods or geographical regions. Sometimes there are particular technical meanings to the terms — as, for example, in some of its uses by oral historians or, in a different way, by the oral-formulaic scholars — but in general it has been used as a way into new interpretations and approaches, whether drawing attention to new materials, not hitherto usually the subject of scholarly study, or to new questions about old material.

But what exactly *is* ‘orality’? Before tackling that question directly let me start by looking at some features of the new interpretations and questions that the term has led to, and the way it has thus both increased and — sometimes — hindered our greater understanding. This should help to give some of the background, and illuminate our central question further.

*

What, then, have been the benefits we have gained from using the concept of orality?

Perhaps the most immediate one to come to mind is the part it has played in widening our perceptions of the works of human literary imagination. It has helped to alert us to new material to study and appreciate. In my own case, for example (no doubt like many other humanist scholars), I grew up with the implicit conviction that written texts — and in particular of course the written texts of certain highly attested canons — were somehow the most proper subject of study, and that there was something ‘real’ and substantive about them not shared by the fleeting and contingent flow of spoken words (a familiar enough assumption in literary scholarship even now). The idea that there could be something justifiably called *oral* literature was at one point a mind-blowing idea (it is perhaps rather hard to recall this now, when the idea is — in some circles anyway — so easily accepted; but many, like me, may remember their first experience of that idea).

New doors into the appreciation of human culture have thus been opened for us by scholars working with the concept of oralness. This dates back further than is sometimes supposed. The term ‘oral literature’, for example, was already being used in the nineteenth century (e.g. Chatelain 1984:16) and was a key idea in the Chadwicks’ great comparative work *The Growth of Literature* (1932-40) and in Nora Chadwick’s shorter summary of ‘The distribution of oral literature’ in the Old World (1939). And in the meantime a huge amount of material had been gathered, under various labels, from Africa, the Pacific and parts of Europe (Finland and Ireland above all come to mind, but there was also important work — and analysis — in Eastern Europe), by missionaries, folklorists, administrators and, more recently, by anthropologists. These collections of texts of poems, songs, and narratives of many different kinds had been fired not only by intellectual interests but also by nineteenth- and twentieth-century nationalist movements seeking national identity in oral tradition. So there is a long background to our study. But it was not really until the 1960s and later, however, with the publica-

tion of Milman Parry and Albert Lord's enormously influential analysis of South Slavic epic as oral literature in Lord's *The Singer of Tales*, that the term 'oral literature' really started gaining a wider currency among researchers across a number of academic disciplines.

That concept — or the alternative more abstract 'orality' — had several advantages which could be extended beyond the specific cases to which it had originally been applied.

Perhaps the most important of all, it gave a kind of validity to non-written material which could otherwise seem outside the pale of 'proper' academic disciplines. In doing so it was able to extend our sympathies and understanding of the range of human culture. It turned our attention to voices which before had so often been unheard — the colonised and remote, the underclasses long despised by those steeped in elite high culture, women (so often the composers and performers of laments and other oral forms) — or to the political protest songs or satires of the oppressed or rebellious, from Ireland in the last century to Africa or Bulgaria in this. These *oral* texts were real too, it emerged, and it was not, after all, just in written literature that human verbal art could be subtly expressed and studied.

The term 'oral' also directed attention to certain features of unwritten literary expression that before had been far from obvious to scholars. This was particularly so in its usage by Albert Lord and his students. While there are a number of points on which I would dissent from the conclusions of some of the more extreme proponents of the so-called 'oral theory', it has to be said that rich comparative studies were opened up by Lord's use of the term 'oral' to elucidate the processes of composition and literature. As he pointed out, the heroic singers that he studied produced not fixed and final texts but rather poetic processes of composition by which each performance was liable to be different and unique in itself; there were no single 'correct' texts, as with written literature; and composition took place not beforehand but actually in the act of performance.

Distinguishing these features of oral art — or at any rate of some oral art — not only led to opening up new questions about texts (of which more below) but also provided a foundation for

cross-cultural comparisons through which scholars could connect previously separate and apparently unrelated studies. The development of the consequent comparative movement — extremely influential now across the world — gave scholars from a wide range of different disciplines new insights and a new confidence in studying material which before might have seemed somewhat peripheral to serious academic scholarship. As such it has led to a huge body of well-founded scholarship.¹

But there is more here than just the accumulation of empirical work and the extension of our interests to new and wider fields. For the concept of 'oral' and 'orality' has also challenged scholars to turn to new questions — or, if not totally new, at least to revive interest in certain issues.

One of these was the need to look critically at the concept of 'text'. The idea that the text as *product* was not the only aspect to consider began to gain greater currency for there were also questions to be asked about the *processes* underlying the texts studied by scholars. There were the questions, for example, about transmission and composition, leading to a much fuller awareness that there could be changing processes inherent in what looked at first sight like a finished complete text.

This is a point that comes out particularly clearly from the work of the oral-formulaic scholars. But it also related well to work going on in anthropology or folklore through field observations of the actual delivery of, for example, oral stories. I recall that when in 1960 I first started to study story-telling among the Limba of Sierra Leone in West Africa, I expected that the end result would be the collection and recording of finished texts which I would then transcribe and bring back to England. But actually observing the process of story-telling brought home very clearly that these stories were not fixed artefacts — final and correct texts — which could be collected and dissected once and for all, but rather the changing and creative formulations of individual human tellers, putting forward their own interpretations of various traditional conventions and themes to particular audiences on par-

1. A recent convenient summary is given in Foley 1988 (and bibliography in Foley 1985).

ticular occasions, different each time. These were not (as I had assumed on the basis of my earlier classical training) finalized texts, and they had to be studied as active processes, not frozen products.²

This understanding of the potentially dynamic and changing quality of unwritten texts, poems, and songs of the kind that are so often also defined as 'traditional' or 'folk' has now become much more widely (though not universally) accepted: yet another spin-off from the concept of 'oral'. There is now an impetus to investigate the processes by which these texts were formulated — asking for example about the manner of composition and the interaction between individual creativity and traditional conventions — rather than just taking the texts as final and given.

Questions about performance too have begun to attract more attention. This is a further corollary of the recognition of texts as 'oral' — for in most cases 'oral' means realised in performance.

Let me give another example from my own fieldwork. I was enormously impressed by hearing Limba stories in the field — by their subtlety, imaginativeness, creativity, drama and human qualities, and I recorded a large corpus of them. But when I came back and typed up my transcriptions I could not understand why they seemed so lifeless. All the wisdom and art that I thought I had seen seemed to be gone. Maybe I could evoke a little of this through my memories, but to others they seemed 'simple' traditional tales, to be collected as a fossil, perhaps, but with no truly human or literary interest.

It took me a little time to realise (what I think most fieldworkers would now recognise much more quickly — we *have* progressed!) that this was because the text on the page left out all those performance elements that were integral to this particular art form. The literary effectiveness and insights of Limba stories rested on far more than just the verbal *text* that could be transcribed and then published on a printed page. It was also inextricably dependent on the delivery skills of the story-teller — such as vocal

2. It was in part due to having later read Lord's *Singer of Tales* (1960) that I was able to follow up that field experience (1960-61) in the context of the wider comparative questions that that work raised, but folklorists' analyses of style and performance (e.g. Delargy 1945, Dorson 1960) were also extremely stimulating.

delivery, facial expressions, gestures, or clever use of mimicry or dramatisation: an effective way, often, of introducing the elements of characterisation or conveying inner feeling that those without first-hand experience of such performances sometimes naively think are lacking in oral tales. There was also the subtle conveying of rapid dramatic narrative, of shocking arrogance, of brooding tragedy or of ironic comment through *how* the words were delivered rather than the words in themselves — all the subtlety and universal commentary, as it were, on the human condition which the texts alone, without the performance, did not manage to convey. As well there were the songs (and occasionally dances) with which the stories were embellished and which provided both an interlude in which the audience could join in and a clever means of structuring and advancing the plot. The whole interplay with the audience formed another essential element. One member of the audience was regularly chosen by the narrator to take the active role of the 'replier' in the telling, by asking rhetorical questions, taking the lead in enacting shock, or horror, or surprise as needed, adding the occasional comment to underline the irony or wonder of the situation, and generally playing the part of the 'common man' as both listener and foil to the main narrator. The whole audience too was expected to participate in the telling by laughing, exclaiming, singing and generally forming part of the whole occasion. These often non-verbal elements of performance were, I came to realise, an essential, not just a marginal part, of Limba stories — and, indeed, *mutatis mutandis* of all oral performances (further details on Limba storytelling and performance in Finnegan 1967).

Perhaps every fieldworker has to discover the performance qualities of oral texts for herself, and of course the details differ with different genres, but this is an aspect that, it is now widely realised, repays investigation in any study of oral forms. This emphasis on the significance of performance — and thus on aspects that are wider than just the narrow verbal text — goes along with a number of consonant moves in wider scholarship. Among these are the widening linguistic interests in *spoken* (and thus performed) rather than just *written* language, perhaps the literary analysts' 'demoting of the text', field studies by anthropologists and others

of living oral forms, and certainly the influential work by the American 'performance-orientated' folklorists and anthropologists such as Roger Abrahams, Dennis Tedlock, Richard Bauman or Dell Hymes (among others). The key factor here is the identification of texts as 'oral'; and *hence* of their performed quality.

The upshot is that — as well demonstrated in several of the papers in this Colloquium — there is now an increasing awareness that with oral forms there are questions to be pursued about more than just the verbal text. And, further, that the wider comparative evidence can be drawn on to alert us both to some understanding of the significance of performance in general and to the *kinds* of possible performance elements that it may be worth looking out for in one's own area of interest.

This appreciation of the 'oral' quality of certain forms has also led to new theoretical approaches and questions in the sense of a rethinking of some older problems and a new look at some of our existing texts. Sometimes these approaches were already in the air, but the 'oral movement' or 'oral theory' gave them important extra impetus and confidence.

Much of this has concentrated on the re-analyses of existing texts in terms of their apparent 'oral composition', following the oral-formulaic model of composition demonstrated in the work of Parry and Lord and their followers. Thus a remarkable number of historical texts, from Homer, the Bible and *Beowulf*, to Indian epic, *The Song of Roland* or Scottish and Hispanic ballads, have been reanalysed as the product of oral composition.³ And while such assessments do sometimes have their share of confusion or controversy, nevertheless many scholars — in medieval studies particularly perhaps — have felt that these and similar questionings of some of the old assumptions (for example in Walter Ong's work) have opened up marvellously new windows beyond the older views. They have led to the possibility of exploring the *oral* elements of that culture: a real breath of en-
vigorating fresh air.

3. Indeed such analyses have become almost an industry in their own right (for a summary of, and reference to, some of these, see Foley 1985, 1988).

The interest in orality has also raised new questions about our approach to texts more generally. In particular, what *is* a text? and how should we present texts? At one time, such questions seemed unnecessary, but from the recognition of the *oral* — and hence both dynamic and ephemeral — nature of oral texts there follows the need to think about the processes by which texts become formulated, and by whom: they are not automatically fixed and complete for ever. So questions arise about *which* version should be recorded (or has in the past been recorded) to enter the canon, selected by whom and for what reasons, or what is or might be missing in the versions that we have. It is easy to assume that, for example, the ‘myths’ we have in our collections, from whatever area of the work they ultimately come, are, as it were, ‘*the* Myths’ of such and such a people, handed down exactly in the tradition for generations immemorial and the joint heritage of the people. But scholars are now starting to look more closely at questions such as who wrote these down and why. In the case of non-European and colonised people these were often the overseas antiquarians and missionaries or those educated by them, with consequent implications for the content and context of their recorded versions. This has drawn attention to their contingent rather than necessarily long-established genesis, particularly when we consider the motives of the collectors in shaping the specific form in which they were then published and circulated as authoritative (for examples from South Pacific mythology see Finnegan 1988: chap.6). And though the existing collections of historical texts have not of course all gone through exactly the same process, such examples have suggested some parallel questions that can be worth pursuing.

Quite apart from the different reasons people may have to record oral texts in one form or another, it is often in practice quite hard to decide what really is the ‘authentic text’, even if one has observed and recorded its actual performance for oneself and is determined to be true to the original. I can illustrate this again from my Limba fieldwork. Let me leave aside the question of *which* of several differing tellings I decided to publish — not that this is ever a question that can be fully solved satisfactorily (and yet, as we can see in the many publications of such

texts, one which in practice has to be solved one way or the other in the end: usually without any further comment or explanation). But there was also the apparently innocuous question: having decided on a particular narration, what exactly *was* the real 'text' of it. I almost never recorded a story without some 'extraneous' noise of interruptions — the crying of a baby, goats bleating, rain hammering down and drowning bits of the tape, someone coming past and greeting — should all that appear? Maybe not — but it was part of the real situation of the oral narration, and surely one element if we want to consider performance and context. . . ? And what about the songs — jointly performed by narrator and audience — or the words of the 'replier' that I mentioned earlier, or the audience's laughter or rejoinders? That looked much more central to the story — and yet in most transcriptions all or most of such content does not appear. And what about the many repetitions which in a written text look contrived or boring, but yet were so often basic to the oral effect in actual performance? Once again there is no right answer here. But such questions certainly make one start to query the common Western model of a text as something bounded and final — a kind of enduring abstract model divorced from the contingencies of context or performance — for a more dynamic and relative concept to do with actual realisation through performance(s) in particular context(s). And should we therefore go on to wonder about some of those other historical texts that have come down to us as canonical — are they too less definitive than we have assumed?

There is also the question — even if one decided on which bits of one's recording to take forward — of *how* to present such oral texts. Is the normal linear representation through print on a page sufficient? Some have urged strongly that it is not, arguing for example (as does Dennis Tedlock) that giving no representation of performance features such as speed, volume or rhythm, is in the case of orally performed texts the equivalent of printing musical scores with no indication of time. He and others have developed unconventional ways of conveying this on the printed page (e.g. Tedlock 1980, Seitel 1981) — neither an easy nor cheap

way of publishing, but this format demonstrates well the point they are making. Nowadays there is also the possibility of audio and video recordings which (though not without their own problems) can highlight some of those other elements of performance which, once again, remind us of the desirability of at least *asking* about such elements in oral texts. Having made such records, should we use them for publishing the 'real' text? and what then is the text? and does this again raise questions for our assessment of the status (and completeness) of oral texts recorded from the past?

Such questions cannot always be answered, nor should we just try to translate the findings of modern fieldwork directly into the analysis of older texts. Nevertheless the insights from this more recent work on oral texts have served the purpose of opening up new questions which sometimes *can* be investigated. Furthermore they can also lead us, perhaps, to look again at some implicit assumptions of recent Western civilization — or, at least, of certain models that many of us grew up taking for granted — and wonder how far bounded models of texts as inherently verbal and complete are altogether satisfactory when we move from written to oral forms. At the least, understanding the oral and contingent nature of some of these forms can widen — and challenge — certain views about the nature of literature and thought, and their formulation as texts, opening up new ways of looking at both the world around us and the existing corpus of historical texts.

The questions are of course not simple ones, and some (not all) scholarship has now moved on from what at one point was perceived as a rather simple literate/oral, us/them, civilised/primitive dichotomy (a still powerful model, as I discuss later, but fortunately with a diminishing hold). So scholars now pursue questions not just about whether some particular people (or product) was oral *or* literate in some aspect, but rather about the interaction between oral and written modes or sources, or the possibility of *several* different processes (say, of oral and/or written composition) going on concurrently even in the same culture. Many scholars would now also query the older model which sees 'oral' as always old or 'traditional' or rural, moving instead to the view that oral and written modes can interact in almost any

kind of situation, and that oral processes take place not just in the far away and long ago, but also in the cities of modern times. This again has led to new perspectives on both the present and the past, through the realisation that 'orality' is not just something strange that needs to be explained or explained away — whether contemptuously or glamorously — but a concept which, learning from the comparative perspective it engenders, can help us to see not only others but ourselves more clearly.

So much for some of the advantages of the term 'orality'. It has widened our horizons and drawn our attention to forms of human creativity before neglected or unnoticed, given us new questions to ask, encouraged re-analysis of what we thought we already knew, and, over all, through the use of the concept of 'oral' provided a comparative and unifying perspective on what used to be the work of many separated scholars.

*

But are there costs to set against the benefits of the term? I believe that there are. So let me take a little space to discuss briefly what I think the dangers can be.⁴

The basic problem, it seems to me, is that having got hold of a useful adjective, we then, in typical academic manner, turn it into a noun and give it more pressure than it can bear. Certainly, all the questions and points I have already mentioned are valuable ones. But I become sceptical when they are turned into generalised and abstract models, and models, furthermore, which are then regarded as automatically applicable to certain categories — in this case to anything which can in any way be called 'oral'.

Take 'oral composition' for example. The particular form discovered by Parry and Lord in their fieldwork in Yugoslavia in the 1930s enlarged our understanding enormously; it is clear that elements of this particular syndrome (composition-in-performance based on oral-formulaic processes) are indeed to be found, in one way or another, very widely throughout the world. But in *all* forms that are to be called 'oral'? That is much more

4. These are elaborated in more detail in some of my other publications, esp. 1988.

problematic — and yet this has been asserted or implied by many (not all) of the ‘oral-formulaic’ authors.⁵ The basic message is often implied that we have now located *the* oral process, and this is then only too easily assumed to apply automatically wherever or whenever any phenomenon is termed ‘oral’ in any sense. Similarly other writers have sometimes taken the term ‘oral tradition’ to be one undifferentiated and clearcut *thing* (as if with the same characteristics everywhere), ‘oral society’ as a meaningful and comprehensive characterisation of a single type of society, and the many differing modes of thought or thinking throughout the variegated riches of so many human cultures as summed up in the supposedly meaningful ‘oral mentality’. These simple-sounding terms are used as if they could really encapsulate in a single concept all the diverse ways (and we know from historical and anthropological research that they are diverse) in which human cultures and individuals outside a certain Western literate elite tradition have formulated and created and transmitted their insights and imagination. It seems a gross over-simplification — either that or a smokescreen, producing high-sounding academic concepts to fill in for our own ignorance.

I must also of course recognise that there is a real problem here, since after all we need general words if we are to use a comparative approach at all, and — a hoary problem for all translators — few words if any are ever cross-culturally satisfactory without introducing some element of misunderstanding. So is ‘orality’ worse than others? Academics too particularly thrive on abstract terms, the traditional building blocks in their accepted forms of discourse, and a necessary stimulus for intellectual communication and progress. Such terms are all the more important in this case, given the different disciplinary and regional backgrounds of the various scholars engaged in the study of ‘orality’ in its various forms.

So we *have* to have some general words, even if imperfect for many of our purposes. But this does not absolve us from the duty

5. For some of the arguments about this continuing controversy see e.g. Finnegan 1977 Chap.3, 1988 Chap.5, etc. Some of the leading scholars in the school now admit — even begin to highlight — greater diversity, see e.g. the very good discussion in Foley 1988:109ff.

to choose these carefully and use them critically. What we must avoid is selecting terms which are misleading in drastically oversimplifying a complex reality and/or imbued with hidden, but questionable, assumptions.

It seems to me that both of these have become real dangers with 'orality'.

First, the term unavoidably conveys an impression of uniformity and simplicity. It is a word open to be used, often unthinkingly, to reduce the rich variety of human expressiveness to what is assumed to be a single simple model. It is assumed, what is more, that it means *something* specific and concrete — whereas in fact it has not been solidly established by empirical research that there *is* something specific and concrete to which this general term rightly refers at all.

This is not to say that certain conclusions about specific 'oral' processes in specific times or places have not been established. They certainly have (but perhaps the more convincingly when the adjective 'oral' rather than the abstract noun 'orality' has been in question). But even here it is worth bearing in mind that the term 'oral' itself is not by any means clear. The OED gives two broad meanings: one ('spoken') contrasting with 'written', the other ('using speech only') contrasting with non-verbal communication e.g. through gestures — not the same thing. Even if we focus on the first of these (which most scholars tend to do, though often with some evocations of the second), there are still several *different* respects in which poetry (or any kind of human communication) can be 'oral' — e.g. in composition, in transmission, or in performance — not all of which may necessarily go together; and even that omits the different processes through which each of *these* may be achieved. The term thus raises *questions* (useful ones), rather than giving us all the answers.

Or rather — it *should* raise questions. But only too often it is used as if the term could absolve us from asking what the characteristics of a particular oral form actually are. Just saying that something is 'oral' sometimes seems to release scholars from the need to go on to investigate — as if once the term is used we can just focus on the minor details for we *already* know the broad characteristics of, for example, the processes of com-

position, social function, transmission from the past, outlook of poet and audience. Sometimes such things *are* already known — but this is by virtue of detailed research, not by virtue of the simple clapping on of the term ‘oral’.

These dangers in the term ‘oral’ — the counterpart to its other advantages — are further compounded in the wider term ‘orality’. This is a fashionable concept at present, not least owing to the popular and influential works of Ong and Havelock,⁶ so it is worth pondering these a little further. Some of the dangers run on the same lines as already indicated above — the temptation to presume that the term *must* surely correspond to one concrete and single phenomenon otherwise scholars surely wouldn’t use it (even if for the moment one can’t quite remember or verbalise what that is!), one established by research, and — somehow and somewhere — with a clear and agreed meaning: none of which, I would hold, is actually so. But — and this is the second major danger I want to emphasise — there are yet other bases for misunderstanding in the popular stereotypes which, though applicable also to the other terms, seem to come out most frequently when we start relying on wider terms like ‘orality’.

One of the most influential of these associations with the term ‘orality’ — and a misleading one in my view — is with vast historical stages through which humankind is envisaged as moving in one evolutionary direction. First, goes the story, comes orality, then literacy, then print (as an extension and intensification of literacy), then electric and electronic communication — stages put forward in clear technologically deterministic fashion by McLuhan (e.g. 1967, 1970) and taken up by many writers, notably Walter Ong (1982), since. Each stage is pictured as having its own characteristics, determined crucially by its medium of communication; and as each new medium is introduced, so do society and the individuals within it undergo revolutionary change to enter the next stage. Thus we can look back to European history (and more recently to colonial experience overseas) to see the effects of literacy or of print and, generalising from this, can understand the nature of its opposite — or earlier —

6. For example Ong 1982, Havelock 1982, Havelock and Hershbell 1978.

stage, 'orality'; the assumption behind this being that these effects and interactions were always and everywhere the same irrespective of specific human purposes or social conditions. The whole model, furthermore, is closely tied up with that romantic but at the same time guilt-ridden projection onto others of our own wishes and nostalgias, apparently so typical of recent Western culture. In this the opposite to our own, supposedly, utilitarian, print-dominated, mechanistic, rationalising, industrial form of life is pictured as being found in that lost Eden dwelt in by those others in the past or far away from us. And then all those dreamlike characteristics can be associated with 'orality', since that is assumed to be the typical characteristic of that other state of being.

This is the background, I would argue, to so many of the assumptions about the properties of orality — and, consequently, of oral and non-literate cultures or individuals. The number of these supposed properties — and, correspondingly, of the opposed properties of literacy — is almost infinite. Thus literacy or print is widely assumed to result in (to give just a few examples — some, as will appear, contradictory): rationality; visual rather than auditory modes of thought and perception; linearity; individualism; central government and oppression; freedom and democracy; industrialisation; secularism; the Reformation; objectivity and hence the possibility of detachment and of science and history; urbanism; large-scale trade and economic development; 'modernisation'; and so on and so on — with 'orality' in each case representing the opposite.

Now in many cases, literacy *does* seem to have been associated with some of these characteristics. But the trouble is that in most cases it is almost impossible to establish that it was just *literacy* that was the cause (almost always it was only one factor in an extremely complex situation where, many would also argue, social and political conditions played as large a determining role as literacy *per se*). And in so far as we can try to detect causes and effects at all, there are also so many counter-examples where there were apparently opposite effects that it remains very hard to generalise with any confidence. Of course, it would be pleasant if we *could* generalise in this way — partly to fulfil the dreamlike projection I mentioned earlier, partly to fit with that same old

nineteenth-century stereotype (still so influential on all our thinking) of the Great Divide between Us and Them, the ‘watershed’ as Talcott Parsons once called it (1966:26) representing ‘the fateful development out of primitiveness’ through our acquisition of writing — together with all the supposed properties that have so often been assumed to go along with that division and which it is thus so easy to associate, evidence or not, with literacy and orality respectively.

The arguments about the social implications of literacy and of orality continue (see e.g. Goody 1986, 1987, Finnegan 1988) and can obviously not be finally settled here. The point I wish to assert, however, is precisely that the implications of literacy — and hence the supposed characteristics of ‘orality’ — are *not* settled and agreed. To use the term as if they were, however tempting it is to do so, is to run ahead of the evidence.

The term gets its effects, however, partly because of all these popular stereotypes. And, however careful one is, it is almost impossible to use the concept of ‘orality’ without evoking these associations in many readers’ minds (even if not — insidiously — in one’s own too). In my case at least, the attempt to use it (in *Literacy and Orality*, 1988) ended up in a desire to reject the broad term and focus instead on more specific lower-level questions. And a number of scholars would now argue that it is time to give it up (e.g. Barber and Farias 1989:3).

In general terms, then, my view is that the broader term of ‘orality’ can be dangerously misleading. The various oral elements and processes which have, at various times and places, been established through research simply do not — as the term ‘orality’ implies — add up to one monolithic and established whole. And to behave as if they did is to deny the many differences in how oral processes take place in practice, in the different respects in which an activity or product can be oral, or in the differing meanings scholars have attached to the term: to deny, it could almost be said, the real diversity and richness of human creativity. The various middle-range patterns and questions or the new theoretical challenges that — as I discussed earlier — have arisen from the concept of ‘oral’ open doors to our understanding. But trying to use and establish the concept ‘orality’ does the opposite.

So, after that quick run-through some of the insights and problems that have come from using the term (or versions of it) — what *is* ‘orality’?

On the basis of what I have just been arguing, it may come as no surprise that I added an apparent afterthought to my title: ‘What is orality — *if anything?*’. For my overall conclusion is that in one sense ‘orality’ is *not* anything; or at any rate not anything in the apparently unitary sense that the term seems to imply. It is currently a fashionable term, and one which, as I have tried to indicate, carries with it a whole series of often-hidden assumptions (even if not always in the scholarly writings themselves, then often by the readers of these publications). It is important not to be taken for a ride and conclude that *because* the term is around and used there is necessarily something in the real world — known and agreed by scholars — to which it applies. This is not so. Furthermore there is something in the term which appeals to the romantic and mystical in us, that call from the far-away but treasured ‘other’, the nostalgic ‘world we have lost’ — a powerful and in its way valuable appeal, but nonetheless a poor basis for establishing rigorous empirical conclusions. Certainly there are detailed questions — and to some extent conclusions — which, as I have discussed, we can come up with about unwritten products and processes which can relate to scholarly empirical work and lead to illuminating conclusions or reassessments of existing material and approaches. But for the most part these are more often the result of wielding the adjective (not the abstract noun) as a stimulus for investigating particular products, situations or processes in a more specific way.

The term ‘oral’ can, then, indeed direct us to many interesting questions, but even then — let alone drawing in the connotations of the more generalised abstract term — the concept and its application need to be defined and researched, rather than just assumed as already known. Using the more generalised ‘orality’ compounds the problems. It gives the impression that it refers to something concrete and unambiguous, empirically established, when this is quite simply not the case; it links with a whole

set of implicit and confusing connotations which, if made explicit, many scholars would not in fact accept; and it suggests the existence of some clear-cut and single set of characteristics where, even when some may have been established in some cases, there is no solid agreement as to which features are central or whether they always necessarily go together.

What is 'orality' then? My first answer is, therefore, and in the sense I have just explained — '*Nothing*'.

But that is not quite the end of the matter. The term also has certain functions — one aspect of meaning in actual usage — and ones not altogether to be sniffed at.

First, I would say part of its significance is that it is an extremely convenient *slogan*. It forms a useful label and motivation for getting scholars together to share their ideas (this Colloquium on orality and modern Greek poetry among others is one good example) and in communicating in joint comparative work. It is a signal to ourselves and others that we are in some sense engaged in a common endeavour. And it provides a handy abstract term to publicise certain academic interests and schools of thought (that last is indeed rather an important function given the way abstract terms are so often taken to be a prerequisite for proper academic respectability).

That may sound a provocative assertion, and indeed is intended as such. The term has certainly often enough been used in this way, and as an observer of, as well as participant in, the academic scene I offer this conclusion with some touch of cynicism. But it is not a wholly negative point. It is important and necessary for both individual scholars and collective institutions to have slogans to label, encourage and formulate their intellectual pursuits. In this respect 'orality' (together with the various adjectival uses of the term 'oral') has performed a far from trivial function and, as I discussed earlier, has led to far-reaching and, I hope, now irreversible new insights and approaches in the appreciation of human cultures.

Second, this label of 'orality' plays an important role in reminding us of a range of questions that not all scholars in the past have directed their attention to. It has led to new approaches and controversies, together with a growing body of literature where

such questions are discussed. Even if — as I would argue — the answers to such questions are not always as fully agreed as some suppose, a knowledge of this literature can both stimulate and inform more detailed work on specifics: there is no need for each of us in turn to independently invent the wheel. Above all, the work publicised under the heading of ‘oral’ or of ‘orality’ can draw our own detailed specialist work — whether on medieval and modern Greek poetry, Homer, modern Pentecostal sermons or Limba story-telling — into a comparative framework where, even if we cannot always reach definitive worldwide generalisations, we can at least see our own particular academic preoccupations in a wider perspective.

To summarise my final conclusion then. ‘Orality’, I would argue, isn’t anything. In my view, that is (and contrary to the assumptions of some other scholars), there is nothing clear, definite or agreed to which that abstract noun can refer. *But* the term nevertheless can perform a useful function, provided we go about it with care, in directing us to certain kinds of investigations and insights, labelling and identifying certain aspects of human behaviour, forming a link between scholars interested in a range (even if not a fully agreed one) of partly-shared questions and insights. Insofar as it directs us to anything specific and concrete these are perhaps a series of differing and only sometimes overlapping activities and characteristics, best described by differing senses and applications of the adjective ‘oral’ rather than building up to one unified and monolithic state describable by the noun ‘orality’. Perhaps even better, in the end, would be to treat the term as a kind of verb — an injunction rightly exhorting us to pursue particular questions or a useful slogan to encourage and reinforce certain common interests — rather than a noun which could refer clearly or unambiguously to anything concrete or enduring in the real world.

Open University

References

- Abrahams, R.D. 1968. 'Introductory remarks to a rhetorical theory of folklore', *Journal of American Folklore* 81 143-58.
- Barber, K. and Farias, P.F. de M. (eds). 1989. *Discourse and its Disguises* (Birmingham).
- Bauman, R. 1977. *Verbal Art as Performance* (Rowley, Mass.).
- Bauman, R. 1989. 'Performance', in Eric Barnouw et al. (eds), *International Encyclopedia of Communications III* (New York and Oxford) 262-6.
- Chadwick, H.M. and N.K. 1932-40. *The Growth of Literature*, 3 vols. (Cambridge).
- Chadwick, N.K. 1939. 'The distribution of oral literature in the Old World', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 69.
- Chatelain, M. 1894. *Folk-tales of Angola* (Boston and New York).
- Delargy, J.H. 1945. 'The Gaelic Story-teller', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 31: 177-221.
- Dorson, R.M. 1960. 'Oral styles of American folk narrators', in T.A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language* (New York) 27-51.
- Finnegan, R. 1967. *Limba Stories and Story-telling* (Oxford).
- Finnegan, R. 1977. *Oral Poetry: its Nature, Significance and Social Context* (Cambridge).
- Finnegan, R. 1988. *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication* (Oxford).
- Foley, J.M. 1985. *Oral-Formulaic Theory and Research* (New York).
- Foley, J.M. 1988. *The Theory of Oral Composition: History and Methodology* (Bloomington and Indianapolis).
- Goody, J. 1986. *The Logic of Writing and the Organization of Society* (Cambridge).
- Goody, J. 1987. *The Interface between the Written and the Oral* (Cambridge).
- Havelock, E.A. 1982. *The Literate Revolution in Ancient Greece and its Cultural Consequences* (Princeton).
- Havelock, E.A. and Hershbell, J.P. 1978. *Communication Arts in the Ancient World* (New York).
- Hymes, E.H. 1975. 'Breakthrough into performance' in D. Ben-Amos and K.S. Goldstein (eds), *Folklore: Performance and Communication* (The Hague) 11-74.
- Lord, A.B. 1960. *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).
- McLuhan, M. 1967. *Understanding Media, the Extensions of Man* (London).
- McLuhan, M. 1970. *Counterblast* (London).
- Ong, W. 1982. *Orality and Literacy. The Technologizing of the Word* (London and New York).
- Parsons, T. 1966. *Societies, Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives* (Englewood Cliffs).
- Seitel, P. 1980. *See so that We May See. Performances and Interpretations of Traditional Tales from Tanzania* (Bloomington).
- Tedlock, D. 1972. 'On the translation of style in oral literature', in A. Paredes and R. Bauman (eds), *Toward New Perspective in Folklore* (Austin) 114-33.
- Tedlock, D. 1977. 'Toward an oral poetics', *New Literary History*, 8: 807-819.
- Tedlock, D. 1980. *Finding the Center: Narrative Poetry of the Zuni Indians* (Lincoln and London).
- Tedlock, D. 1983. *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation* (Philadelphia).

Cambridge

The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe

Edited by **ROSAMOND McKITTERICK**

These studies, each by a leading young scholar in the field, set out to provide a factual basis for the assessment of literacy in the early medieval world. They consider the implications of literacy in its relevant context, its uses, levels and distribution across a range of societies.

£35.00 net HB 0 521 34409 3 c. 368 pp.

Forthcoming (September)

Now in paperback

Eternal Victory

Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West

MICHAEL McCORMICK

'Michael McCormick's book is a meticulously thorough survey of . . . imperial and royal victory ceremonies that extends from the reign of the emperor Constantine I into the eleventh century . . . Characterized by exhaustive scholarship and careful analysis, his book makes significant contributions to several important topics'. *American Historical Review*

£14.95 net PB 0 521 38659 4 470 pp.

Past and Present Publications

Co-published with Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris

Monk and Mason on the Tigris Frontier

The Early History of Tur 'Abdin

ANDREW N. PALMER

A study of the early history of the most powerful monastery in Tur 'Abdin, founded in the fourth century and still flourishing today. Aims to rediscover the practical and symbolic function of the monuments of Tur 'Abdin and place them in their original social context thus addressing the relationship between village and monastery.

£37.50 net HB 0 521 36026 9 288 pp.

University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 39



Cambridge
University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK.

Cambridge

Latin Palaeography

Antiquity and the Middle Ages

BERNHARD BISCHOFF

Translated by **DAIBHI O CROININ** and **DAVID GANZ**

This work, by the greatest living authority on medieval palaeography, offers the most comprehensive and up-to-date account in any language of the history of Latin script. Designed as a textbook, it contains a full bibliography.

£35.00 net HB 0 521 36473 6 303 pp.

£12.95 net PB 0 521 36726 3

Economic Expansion in the Byzantine Empire, 900–1200

ALAN HARVEY

Harvey claims that in broadening our comprehension of feudalism, the economic developments of the Byzantine empire and the medieval West appear far more comparable than is traditionally thought. He considers previous studies of this period as being far too negative and opposes the view of this as a period of decline.

£30.00 net HB 0 521 37151 1 318 pp.

Magic in the Middle Ages

RICHARD KIECKHEFER

Covering the years 500 to 1500, this book examines natural and demonic magic and its position in medieval culture. Kieckhefer argues that magic should not be treated as a fringe subject, but rather as an area vital for the understanding of medieval life.

£20.00 net HB 0 521 30941 7 232 pp.

£6.95 net PB 0 521 31202 7

Cambridge Medieval Textbooks



Cambridge
University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK.

Manuscripts:

All editorial correspondence and proofs should be sent to: Dr J.F. Haldon, Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman & Modern Greek Studies, The University of Birmingham, P.O. Box 363, Birmingham B15 2TT. Contributions should be in English (excluding citations from references and sources).

The normal *maximum length* for an article is 8000 words plus footnotes; for a Critical Study, 3500 words; and for a Short Note 1000 words.

All manuscripts must be *typewritten, double-spaced* on A4 and in *clear type*. Faded photocopies will not be considered. *Footnotes* and/or references in the text (in parentheses) may be used. Where footnotes only are provided, full references should be given for each work cited. No bibliography is necessary. Where references in the text only are provided a full bibliography is required. Where *both* references in the text *and* footnotes are employed, the abbreviated reference should be used throughout; but all references must be given in a bibliography.

For the use of italics (denoted in typescript by *underlining*), abbreviations, referencing conventions etc., contributors should follow the example of current issues. For further, detailed notes, apply to the editor.

Subscription:

Orders, subscriptions and enquiries should be addressed to the Business Editor: Professor A.A.M. Bryer, Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman & Modern Greek Studies, The University of Birmingham, P.O. Box 363, Birmingham B15 2TT.

Current subscription prices:

	UK	Overseas	USA
Institutions:	£25.00	£30.00	\$55.00
Individuals:	£17.00	£20.00	\$40.00

Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies is published by the Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman & Modern Greek Studies, The University of Birmingham, P.O. Box 363, Birmingham B15 2TT, England.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 12 (1988)

Anthony Bryer, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*: a partial view

Tim Boatswain, Images of uncertainty: some thoughts on the meaning of form in the art of Late Antiquity

Ruth Macrides, Paul Magdalino, The architecture of *ekphrasis*: construction and context of Paul the Silentiary's *ekphrasis* of Hagia Sophia

Rosemary Morris, The two faces of Nikephoros Phokas

Andrew Palmer (with Lyn Rodley), The inauguration anthem of Hagia Sophia in Edessa: a new edition and translation with historical and architectural notes and a comparison with a contemporary Constantinopolitan Kontakion

David Ricks, Cavafy the poet-historian

Jonathan Shepard, When Greek meets Greek: Alexius Comnenus and Bohemund in 1097-98

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 13 (1989)

Mark C. Bartusis, The Rhythm of the Chancery: seasonality in the issuance of Byzantine imperial documents

Leslie Brubaker, Byzantine art in the ninth century: theory, practice and culture

Catia Galatariotou, *Eros* and *Thanatos*: a Byzantine hermit's conception of sexuality

Basil C. Gounaris, Railway construction and labour availability in Macedonia in the late nineteenth century

D.M. Landsman, The Greeks' sense of language and the 1976 linguistic reforms: illusions and disappointments

Paul Magdalino, Honour among Romaioi: the framework of social values in the work of Digenes Akrites and Kekaumenos

Theodore Natsoulas, The Greeks as an alien minority at the outset of Ethiopia's economic development, 1880-1910

Dimitri Obolensky, Cherson and the conversion of Rus': an anti-revisionist view

Michael Ursinus, Holy Mountain and supreme council: Mount Athos